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This study examined the relationship between trust and collaboration in urban elementary schools, utilizing both qualitative and quantitative methods. Trust was defined as one party's willingness to be vulnerable to another based on the confidence that the latter is benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open. This model of trust received empirical support through both factor analysis and qualitative data analysis.

Faculty trust in four referent groups was explored - trust in the principal, trust in colleagues, trust in students, and trust in parents. For the elementary school sample used in this study, trust in students was statistically indistinguishable from trust in parents. Interview data supported this finding - teachers reported that they extended trust to parents based on their perceptions of the trustworthiness of students. Canonical correlation demonstrated that the overall level of trust in schools was much more strongly influenced by the socioeconomic status of students than by either racial diversity or student mobility. Concerning trust in other teachers, interview data suggested that teachers may make two simultaneous and relatively independent judgments - personal trust, based on expectations of what is owed to one as a fellow human being, and professional trust, based on expectations of others as professional colleagues.
Trust was found to be related to the level of collaboration with teachers and with parents on school-level decisions. Canonical correlation revealed that the level of trust in students and parents was powerfully related to the overall level of collaboration in a school. Trust was also related to other important social processes within schools. In schools where the level of trust was high, communication flowed freely, and teachers went well beyond the minimum requirements of their contractual agreements. In low-trust schools, teachers reported constrained communication networks, colleagues who cut corners on their obligations to the children and the school, and a proliferation of rules that interfered with the smooth functioning of the school.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

There is a growing awareness of the importance of trust in the life of schools. Whether speaking about superintendents and boards, principals and teachers, or students and parents it seems to be on the minds of many who are concerned about schools. In order to solve the problems faced by schools coping with a changing world, various constituencies of the school community must work together. This collaboration requires trust. This study explores these two constructs, trust and collaboration, in the context of schools.

Trust

What is trust? The answer seems so obvious it appears to be an unnecessary question. We know intuitively what it is to trust, we could name several people we trust and conversely, several whom we distrust. And yet, trying to describe precisely what is meant by trust has proven difficult. Articulating a definition of trust has posed difficulties to those who would study the construct, whether in the context of interpersonal, organizational, or societal relationships.

Trust functions as a way of reducing uncertainty (Holmes & Rempel, 1989; Luhman, 1979), of having confidence that our expectations of other people will be met. This confidence is fundamental to human survival and to functioning in our complex and
interdependent society. We count on the people who grow, process, package, and sell our food and medicines to do so properly; we depend on those who build, wire, and plumb our houses to do so sensibly and safely; we rely on other people with whom we share the roadways to obey traffic laws; we trust those who hold and invest our money to deal with us honestly; we depend on our government to maintain infrastructure such as roads, bridges, and water systems, and to protect us from environmental hazards, or from aggressors both foreign and domestic. In short, in every facet of our lives we are dependent on other people to behave in accordance with our expectations. Luhman (1979) observes that a complete absence of trust would make it impossible for a person to function or even to get out of bed in the morning. Absent a reasonable level of predictability, uncertainty would be “beyond human endurance” (p. 4).

Trusting that others can be believed is an important element in all human learning. Rotter (1967) asserted that, “Much of the formal and informal learning that human beings acquire is based on the verbal and written statements of others, and what they learn must be significantly affected by the degree to which they believe their informants without independent evidence” (p. 651). Webb (1992) echoed this proposition, pointing out that much of what we know in the fields of history, geography, science, and a great many other fields can only be learned by relying on the words of other people. He proposed,

One is justified in believing what other people say, provided only that there is no positive reason to doubt them...After all, if I am not justified in believing others, then I don’t know that there is such a place as Australia, that electrons have plus or minus one-half spin, that Pluto has a moon, or even that I am thirty-four years old; I can’t know so much as the time of day. (p. 390)
Webb explained that trust is even fundamental to learning a common language. Learning a language would be impossible if those who know the language were not consistent in their references to objects, and did not correct the misuse of words or syntax in a reliable way. Speaking a common language forms a linguistic community. Webb asserted that people are justified in trusting others within their own community because people in a community have a stake in one another being generally reliable (pp. 396-397).

Trust then, is vital to human survival, learning, and functioning in a complex society. Zand (1971), however, warns that trust is "not the global feeling of warmth or affection but the conscious regulation of one’s dependence on another" (p. 230). Trust functions as a way to keep participants in a community or collective in line. It can be costly to earn the distrust of others one must interact with in an ongoing relationship. Such distrust would make it difficult for people to cooperate in accomplishing common goals.

Schools play a special role in society and as such the relationships of trust in schools are vital. Students must trust their teachers in order to learn. School personnel must trust one another in order to cooperate toward accomplishing a common goal. Schools must be trusted by the communities that sponsor and fund them. Even so, studies of trust in the context of schools are scarce.

**Trust as a Control Mechanism**

Trust functions not only as a means of reducing uncertainty, it also serves as a mechanism of control. Arrow (1974) pointed out the advantage of trust in this regard, “Trust is an important lubricant of a social system. It is extremely efficient; it saves people a lot of trouble to have a fair degree of reliance on other people’s word” (p. 23). Increasingly, trust
is recognized as a vital element in well-functioning organizations. Trust is necessary for effective cooperation and communication, which are the foundations for cohesive and productive relationships in organizations (Baier, 1986; Parsons, 1960). Trust reduces the complexities of transactions and exchanges far more quickly and economically than other means of managing organizational life (Powell, 1990, 1996).

Relationships within organizations tend to be ongoing in that people expect to continue to relate to the same network of people over time. When this is the case, there is incentive to behave in ways that are trustworthy, to develop a reputation for trustworthiness, and to reap the benefits of trusting relationships. Engendering distrust can be costly. As trust declines the costs of doing business increase because people must engage in self-protective actions and be “continually making provisions for the possibility of opportunistic behavior” on the part of others (Limerick & Cunnington, 1993, pp. 95-96). In the absence of trust “people are increasingly unwilling to take risks, demand greater protections against the possibility of betrayal, and increasingly insist on costly sanctioning mechanisms to defend their interests” (Tyler & Kramer, 1996, pp. 3-4). As a result, the social network of relationships within an organization can exert both formal and informal control that encourages people to act in a trustworthy manner.

The Utility of Distrust

Distrust is also an important and effective mechanism for control in society. It provides a means of accountability in situations where people have authority and power to make decisions that affect the well-being of others. Barber (1983) notes the value of distrust,
Distrust is not, as it sometimes is alleged, always paranoid and irrational, but may be based on knowledge, experience and values... Trust is never enough for effective social control because the differential power of various groups in society has consequences that cannot be satisfactorily managed by trust alone. (pp. 166-167)

Barber explains that in society distrust is bolstered by laws, enforcement agencies, elections, insurance, disapproval and other forms of both formal and informal sanctions imposed on those who violate the trust of others.

There is a growing perception that American society has become increasingly distrustful of its institutions and leaders. Barber (1983) argues that this perception is the result not of less trustworthiness on the part of particular people or institutions, but of the rapid changes in our society. These changes include changing values and higher expectations, and a greater awareness of inequality on the part of the common person. He argues,

There are at least three major reasons for the decline in public trust. One has to do with the ever more powerful knowledge that the professions now have to influence individual and public welfare. Another has to do with the increasing strength of the value of equality in our society, the increasing desire of the less powerful of all kinds to have a little more control over those whose greater power vitally affects them. Ours is revolutionary time for the value of equality. Finally, a third is the increased knowledge and competence that a better educated public brings to its relations with professionals and other experts and leaders. (p. 132)

Higher expectations create the demand for higher levels of trustworthiness from all citizens. These expectations are especially brought to bear on those who would educate our children. The actions of these professionals influence not only the world as it is but as it will be. As educators are increasingly viewed as having the power to determine the economic future of children, and as they are charged with reducing economic disparities in our society, schools
are increasingly feeling the brunt of public distrust. As trustees of our nations’ children, school personnel need to understand the complex dimensions and dynamics of trust.

Trust and Schools

Trust is pivotal as American society considers its schools. Baier (1986) defines trust as the reliance on others’ competence and their willingness to look after rather than harm what is entrusted to their care.

Since the things we typically do care about and value include such things as we cannot singlehandedly either create or sustain...we must allow many other people to get into positions where they can, if they choose, injure what we care about, since those are the same positions that they must be in in order to help us take care of what we care about. (p. 236)

What we care about may be things tangible, such as our children or our money, or things intangible such as democracy, or norms of respect and tolerance. Schools look after all of these for our society, and consequently, the issue of trust is vital in the study of schools.

Schools are also vested with our increasing vision of equality. This has created new roles and expectations for our schools. Goodlad (1984) observed that society used to be content with schools that functioned to sort and rank students for various strata of our society. That goal is being supplanted by a newer goal of fostering equality of opportunity for all students, even those with learning difficulties or disabilities or who come from lower socioeconomic strata. And yet, schools struggle to realize these new aspirations. Almost a half century after the Brown decision to desegregate the schools, the dream of schools eliminating class distinctions and providing equal opportunities to learn seems far from becoming reality. The professional knowledge possessed by teachers is held suspect as much touted innovations (e.g. open classrooms or new math) fail to bring the dramatic results they
promise. Values promoted by schools may be at odds with the conflicted values of a diverse society. Growing distrust of schools is evidenced in the exploding population of people unwilling to entrust their children to schools at all. From a phenomenon that was virtually unheard of in the early 1980s, in 1997 an estimated 1.23 million American children were taught at home (Home School Legal Defense Association, 1997).

Lack of trust is a serious impediment to many of the reforms taking shape in American schools. Traditional management practices have tended to emphasize social distance and divergent interests among competing parties, and so they have engendered distrust or a low expectation of responsiveness on the part of other parties. New forms of governance are taking shape, with greater expectations of shared interests and goals, greater effectiveness, and greater flexibility to changing demands and environmental pressures (Powell, 1990, 1996). These new forms increasingly require an atmosphere of trust. Moves to site-based management and shared decision making require administrators to trust those who are granted decision making discretion. As school reformers ask teachers to change their fundamental beliefs and instructional techniques, they need to have a community of support in which to challenge and debate new practices (Putnam & Borko, 1997); this kind of community requires trust among teachers. Including parents in school governance requires trust that they will be motivated to work for the common good, not just the narrow interests of their own child. And teaching methods that emphasize collaborative learning and reducing students' alienation by giving them a greater voice in their lives at school require teachers to trust their students. In short, for schools to realize the kinds of positive transformation envisioned by reform efforts, attention must be paid to issues of trust.
Building trust is particularly challenging in urban schools. Berliner and Biddle (1995) document that while many American schools are very competitive with schools around the world, our urban schools tend to be far less effective. In a comparison of suburban and urban school districts where financial resources were held constant Carnoy and Hannaway (1996) attributed the lower effectiveness of urban schools largely to lower levels of trust in the urban districts. Two factors make trust in urban schools more difficult to build and more difficult to sustain: diversity and transience. Greater diversity can make developing trust more difficult (Kipnis, 1996) because people have a tendency to extend trust more readily to people they perceive as similar to themselves. Where cultural and language differences exist people have a harder time perceiving themselves as members of the same community with a stake in mutual reliance. Transience of students, parents, principals and superintendents makes the formation of trust hard to foster, as trust requires knowledge and experience with a person over a period of time. The development of trust seems to require a commitment period in which each party signals both a willingness to be vulnerable to the other party and an unwillingness to exploit the other given the chance (Swinth, 1967). Attention to issues of trust will be crucial in the search for solutions to the problems facing urban schools.

The Study of Trust

The philosopher Baier (1986) has observed that trust is so ubiquitous we only become aware of it when it has been disrupted. "Most of us notice...trust most easily after its sudden demise or severe injury. We inhabit a climate of trust as we inhabit an atmosphere and notice it as we notice air, only when it becomes scarce or polluted" (p. 234). As life has grown more complex, as changing economic realities and changing expectations in society have made life
less predictable, and as new forms of information dissemination have increased both the desire for and availability of gossip, we are beginning to notice trust more.

Although themes of trust and betrayal have long been the subject of philosophers, poets, politicians, and theologians, the empirical study of trust grew out of the escalating suspicion of the Cold War and an optimism that a scientific solution could be found to the dangerous and costly arms race that had resulted (Deutsch, 1958). Trust again became a subject of study in the late 1960s in response to a generation of young people who had become disillusioned and suspicious of the institutions and authorities of society (Rotter, 1967). With soaring divorce rates and radical changes in the American family, the study of trust turned to focus on interpersonal relationships in the early 1980s (Johnson-George & Swap, 1982; Larzelere & Huston, 1986; Rempel, Holmes, & Zanna, 1985). And as shifts in the economy and society have changed norms about what corporations owe their workers and new forms of management are emerging to respond to new technologies and increased global competition, trust has emerged as a subject of interest in the 1990s in organizational science (Gambetta, 1988; Kramer & Tyler, 1996; Shaw, 1997), sociology (Coleman, 1990), and economics (Fukuyama, 1995).

Even with this increased interest, the study of trust has been impaired by the lack of a clear definition of trust. Greater understanding has led to the recognition that trust is complex construct. Simple or unidimensional definitions of trust have proven unsatisfying. Trust is embedded in relationships, the referent of trust influences its meaning. In this study trust is defined as one party’s willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the belief that the latter party is (a) benevolent, (b) reliable, (c) competent, (d) honest, and (e)
open (adapted from Butler & Cantrell, 1984 and Mishra, 1996). Trust is also a dynamic process so to study it is to study a moving target. Trust not only changes over the course of a relationship, the nature of a trusting relationship can be altered instantaneously with a casual comment, a betrayed confidence, or a decision that violates the sense of care one has expected of another. The need to understand the dimensions and dynamics of trust extends to the study of trust in schools.

American society entrusts its children to public schools to teach, guide, counsel, and protect. Yet we know very little about the nature of trusting relationships in a school once the children arrive and the doors are shut. Do the faculty trust one another? Do they trust the principal? Do the teachers trust their students? What is the consequence if they do not? Can students learn from teachers they don’t trust? Do parents trust their children’s teachers and to what extent do the teachers trust the parents? Have changes in society undermined the public’s trust in the schools, and, if so, what can be done to begin to repair that trust? Clearly, this is a fertile area for research.

Intriguing evidence of the significance of trust to school effectiveness as well as to the openness and health of the school climate has begun to emerge. Hoy and his colleagues (1985, 1988, 1989, 1992, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998) have engaged in over a decade of research in the dynamics of faculty trust in the principal and faculty trust in colleagues. However, faculty trust in two important school constituencies, students and parents, remains unexamined. This research seeks to add these two constituencies to the investigation of trust in schools, as well as to develop further the conceptualization of trust as a multidimensional
construct. This study also will examine the dimensions of trust as they relate to the levels of collaboration in schools.

Collaboration

The old adage "two heads are better than one" reminds us that the addition of another person's perspective, knowledge, and experience as well as a process in which ideas are articulated and scrutinized or challenged, frequently leads to higher quality solutions to problems. And yet traditional bureaucratic organizational practices, in the interest of efficiency and accountability, often mean problems are solved by a single decision maker working alone. These practices are increasingly being questioned, and managers and decision makers are encouraged to include others in collaborative problem solving. On the other hand, the adage "Too many cooks spoil the broth" speaks to the messiness of combining diverse opinions and perspectives when trying to come to a decision (as does the quip "a camel is a horse that was put together by a committee"). These adages remind us of the difficulties inherent in collaboration. Two heads aren't always better than one, and including all organizational participants in every decision would clearly be unmanageable, so how are decisions about decision making to be made? Under what conditions are collaborative decisions likely to be superior? And who should be included in which decisions? Are there conditions that must be met for a collaborative process to be productive? How can those conditions be achieved? Clearly many questions remain unresolved as school personnel attempt to construct inclusive problem-solving processes.
Collaboration in Schools

Schools are rich with the opportunities for collaboration and yet traditionally very little occurs. Principals have power to make the decisions to guide and shape schools, and often face alone the difficult task of setting the direction the schools will take. Teachers work alone, confined to their classrooms. Students work individually at tasks in classrooms with norms that consider helping and working together as cheating. Parents are relegated to roles of raising money for "extras" or accompanying the class on field trips to help maintain order. Their conversations with teachers about their child’s progress amount to two brief exchanges a year, if the parents bother to show up at all. Other than running for the school board at the district level, parents are seldom invited to share in the decisions about how schools are run.

But there are alternatives. Increasingly, collaborative practices are springing forth in schools. Principals are including teachers and parents in decision making about the schools. Teachers are working together to question their practice and to design new curricula. Parents find a listening and receptive ear when they share their ideas about the directions the school should take. And teachers engage their students in decisions of classroom governance and curriculum, and construct cooperative learning experiences for their pupils. In this study, collaboration has been defined as a decision-making process in which organizational participants not only have the opportunity to be involved in decisions that affect them but to actually influence the outcome of those decisions as well.

Principal and teachers. Principals are responsible for managing their schools. They are given authority to direct teachers’ activities, to make decisions on behalf of the school, and to set policy. Whether or not to consult others and whom to include in decision-making
is typically left to their discretion. Principals who include teachers not only gain greater acceptance and implementation of decisions made, they also gain broader perspectives, knowledge, and experience. Principals with a reputation for effectiveness, those Leithwood and Steinbach (1995) designated as "expert," tended to have a greater appreciation of the importance of including others in decision making (p. 168). Expert principals "get their projects done by crafting coalitions and building teams of devoted employees who feel a heightened sense of joint involvement and contribution to decisions" (Kanter, 1983, p. 241). 

Woodrow Wilson defined leadership as the ability to induce people to give the gift of their cooperation. Principals can offer leadership of this kind by setting an example of cooperation, and also by establishing structures that encourage the active participation of others.

**Teachers collaborating with teachers.** Teaching is as much art as science. The complexity of considerations that must be taken into account in the myriad of decisions teachers face every day requires that they be equipped with more than static curriculum guides or simplistic notions of teaching. The changing needs of society, changing expectations for schools, and the changing sets of needs brought each day by each group of students makes teaching a demanding task. Leithwood and Steinbach (1995) describe the complexity of the task, "No theoretical principles or abstract guidelines are sufficient to the task faced by teachers under these circumstances. What is required, rather, is a deep understanding of their purposes and how such purposes may be accomplished flexibly and often opportunistically" (p. 98-99). Principals can enhance the productivity and adaptability of their schools by creating structures that facilitate collaboration among teachers.
In order for teachers to successfully rise to the challenge of adapting their teaching practices to meet the changing expectations of various reform initiatives, they must have opportunities to participate in dialogue with other teachers to support and challenge one another. Putnam and Borko (1997) refer to this interaction as "discourse communities" and observe,

Just as students need to learn new ways of reasoning, communicating, and thinking, and to acquire dispositions of inquiry and sense-making through their participation in classroom discourse communities, teachers need to construct their complex new roles and ways of thinking about their teaching practice within the context of supportive learning communities....Just as students cannot learn science by interacting with the physical world without interaction with others who know science, teachers are unlikely to transcend their current view of teaching proactively without an influx of ideas or ways of thinking about teaching, learning, and subject matter from another source. (pp. 18-19)

These collaborative communities provide opportunities for teachers to "reflect deeply and critically on their own teaching practice, on the content they teach, and on the experiences and backgrounds of the learners in their classrooms" (Putnam & Borko, pp. 2-3).

As teachers collaborate in problem solving, they practice the skills involved in the development of expertise enriching the thinking processes of individual teachers and transforming the knowledge of individual teachers into knowledge that is shared throughout the organization. Working with other teachers within a context of mutual respect – but a context that also encourages a productive level of debate, challenge, and conflict – has the potential to invigorate teaching with increased intellectual stimulation. It can also help forge values that are increasingly explicit and shared. Sharing with one another in this way can support the risk taking and struggle entailed in transforming practice. Collaboration can also
help teachers impose meaning and organization on incoming information in light of their existing knowledge and beliefs (Putnam & Borko, 1997).

**Parent and school collaboration.** As the purposes of schooling are coming under debate and are less taken for granted than they were in decades past, parents are increasingly demanding a voice in how schools conduct their business. Parents are being recognized as stakeholders in the educational process. The past three decades have witnessed increased calls for parents to have a voice in the decision making concerning public schools beyond that provided by citizen control of school boards. School advisory councils have been one response. Parent empowerment has been distinguished from parent involvement in that parent involvement includes activities parents have traditionally been involved in with schools, such as attendance at parent-teacher conferences and open houses, while parent empowerment means the inclusion of parents in decision-making roles in the school's governance (Goldring & Shapira, 1993; Griffith, 1996; Mc Grew & Gilman, 1991).

**Teacher and student collaborative experiences.** Teachers who are engaged in collaborative processes and who value those processes may be more likely to construct learning activities for their students that include collaborative experiences (Schmuck & Schmack, 1991). A collaborative school climate sets the stage for student cooperation in the classroom. Teachers may involve students in setting classroom rules and policies, and establishing the consequences for rule breaking. Teachers may involve students in curricular decisions and instructional approaches. Teachers may also create collaborative experiences for students in making use of cooperative learning methods. Teachers who involve students
in these ways value students input and see the value of students’ active construction of knowledge.

**The Need to Study Collaboration**

As promising as collaboration has seemed, and as much as it has been recommended as a remedy for the isolation of teachers and the stagnation of school practices, little is known about how widespread collaborative practices are in schools, what is working well and where stumbling blocks have arisen. One of the impediments to greater collaboration is a lack of trust. Trust and collaboration are here proposed as mutually reinforcing or reciprocal processes, the greater the trust the more collaboration there is likely to be in a school, and the greater collaboration the more trust will be generated.

**Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this research is to explore how the level of faculty trust in the principal, in colleagues, in parents, and in students relates to the level of collaboration between the principal and teachers, between teachers, between the school and parents, and in classrooms.

**Research Questions**

How is the level of involvement and influence teachers perceive they have in the administrative decisions of the school related to their level of trust in the principal? How is teachers’ perception of the level of their collaboration with other teachers in their school related to their level of trust in colleagues? What is the relationship between the level of teachers’ trust in their students and the amount of collaborative learning experiences they provide? Is the amount of parent involvement in organizational decision making in the
school related to the level of trust teachers feel for parents? How is the overall level of trust of the faculty on these four dimensions related to the overall level of collaboration in a school?

**Basic Assumptions**

Both qualitative and quantitative research methods will be used in this study. It is assumed that both methods will provide useful and complementary insights into the nature of trust and collaboration in schools. When confidentiality is assured it is assumed that teachers will give accurate accounts of their perceptions of the level of trust and collaboration in their schools, whether the format is a questionnaire or an interview. Both statistical analysis of survey data and thematic analysis of interviews are expected to provide valid sources of information about these two complex constructs.

**Limitations**

The focus of this study is the faculty, the level of faculty trust in the principal, colleagues, parents, and students and the level of perceived involvement and influence in collaborative decision-making process with each of those constituencies. The reciprocal trust relationships of students' trust in teachers, parents’ trust in both the principal and teachers, and the principal’s trust in teachers would be of interest, however these are beyond the scope of this study. In addition, perceptions of collaboration from other perspectives would also be of interest. And although these are four important constituencies of the school community, they are not all inclusive. Knowledge of the relationships of trust and collaboration with the superintendent, school board members, central office staff, the business community, the legislature, and others would also add to the understanding of these dynamic processes in
schools, but are not explored in this study. All of the schools in the study are elementary schools from one urban district in the Midwest. The extent to which these finding would be replicated in other regions, other urban districts with different structures and management practices, to suburban or rural schools, or to middle or secondary schools awaits further testing.
CHAPTER 2
TRUST

Trust has been recognized as an important construct in such diverse fields as psychology, social psychology, philosophy, sociology, economics, organizational science, and education. A review of some of the important findings from studies in these fields follows, beginning with some of the earliest empirical studies of trust in the late 1950s and 1960s. The definitions of trust in these early studies leads to a discussion of the variety of ways that trust has been defined over that past four decades and the dimensions that are common across definitions. The dynamic nature of trust is explored through an examination of issues of betrayal, distrust, and revenge, and how trust can be rebuilt after it has been damaged. Next, a review of the findings of studies of trust in schools as well as studies in organizational science as they might apply to schools is presented. Finally, factors that might make trust particularly difficult in an urban context are explored.

Beginning the Empirical Study of Trust

Although themes of trust, betrayal, and suspicion have long been the subject of philosophers, poets, politicians, and theologians, the empirical study of trust and suspicion, at least in part, grew out of the Cold War. There was an optimism that a scientific solution could be found to the costly and dangerous arms race between the United States and the
Soviet Union. The Office of Naval Research funded research to investigate suspicion, trust, and conditions affecting cooperation. Deutsch (1958) conducted that research, observing the absence of systematic study of trust up to that point.

**Trust as Cooperation**

Deutsch (1958) highlighted parallels between trust and hope, suspicion and fear. At the same time he also drew some distinctions. Hope, according to Deutsch, only becomes trust when one has invested time, energy or other resources that may be lost or damaged as a consequence of nonfulfillment. Deutsch noted that "one is not necessarily worse off if one’s hope is unfulfilled unless one has trusted one’s hope sufficiently to invest in its fulfillment" (pp. 265-266). Fear is distinguished from suspicion in that "‘fear’ does not necessarily imply behavior to prevent the negative emotional consequences of the ‘feared’ event...One is suspicious of a malevolent event to the extent that its negative consequences can be avoided; one is afraid of it to the extent that the consequences cannot be avoided" (p. 267).

Deutsch’s (1958) definition of trust required an asymmetry of outcomes. He argued "an individual may be said to have trust in the occurrence of an event if he expects its occurrence and his expectation leads to behavior which he perceives to have greater negative motivational consequences if the expectation is not confirmed than positive motivational consequences if it is confirmed" (p. 266). Deutsch defined an event as having positive motivational consequences when it increased or prevented a decrease in the welfare of the individual. Conversely,
an individual may be said to be suspicious of the occurrence of an event if the disconfirmation of the expectation of the event’s occurrence is preferred to its confirmation and if the expectation of its occurrence leads to behavior which is intended to reduce its negative motivational consequences. (p. 267)

Deutsch wanted to avoid equating “expectation” with a specific subjective probability level. He observed that not only did individuals appear to vary considerably from one another but also the same individual might vary from one situation to another in the degree of confidence he or she required before acting in a situation that had the potential for danger or negative consequences.

Cooperation and trust in a game situation. As has been noted, coming to a precise definition of trust has not been easy. Operationalizing trust has been equally difficult. Deutsch operationalized trust as making a cooperative move in a two-person mixed-motive game. Lindskold (1978) described mixed-motive games this way,

Mixed motive conflict is characterized by the presence of (a) the possibility of mutually beneficial cooperation, (b) the temptation to compete so as to exploit the other person’s cooperation, (c) a lack of trust of the other person because of the possibility of his yielding to the temptation to exploit, and (d) the possibility of mutually harmful joint competition arising from both the temptation to compete and the requirement to compete to defend against exploitation. Self-interest (maximization of gains) calls for eventual cooperation because the temptation to exploit the opponent only results in him imposing costs through defensive competition. (p. 772)

These kinds of games are commonly referred to as Prisoner’s Dilemma (PD) games because of a game originally published by Luce and Raiffa (1957). This game posits a player as a prisoner in custody who has been accused of a crime and who has been separated from his or her partner. The district attorney is certain the two partners are guilty of the crime but does not have enough evidence to convict them at trial. The prisoner faces a dilemma – to confess
in exchange for leniency for oneself but a longer sentence for one's partner or to risk a longer sentence by not confessing and being betrayed by one's partner. If neither confesses they will be booked on some minor fabricated charge, and if they both confess they will be given less than the maximum sentence. Another version of this game frames the situation as two trucking companies that must share a single one-lane road to get goods in and out of their respective factories. Again, cooperation makes for mutual gain, while non-cooperation can lead to mutual destruction. Still, exploiting a cooperative partner leads to the greatest gain for any player.

The version of the mixed-motive game employed by Deutsch (1958, 1960a) involved financial payoffs or losses. Deutsch structured his game in keeping with his requirement that the losses sustained if trust was betrayed were greater than gains possible if it was realized. If both partners cooperated they each received $9; however, if they each made an uncooperative choice, they both lost $9. If one player cooperated and his or her partner did not, the uncooperative partner gained $10, and the cooperative player lost $10. Thus, players were said to trust the other player if they made a cooperative choice, because they had made themselves vulnerable to possible but not expected exploitation of the other player. Players were said to be untrustworthy if they took advantage of a partner's cooperative choice to increase their own gains at the expense of the partner. Games were played for either one trial or ten trials, and participants recorded not only their own choice, but what they expected the other player to choose.

This simple game allowed for a number of experimental manipulations. One of the experimental manipulations Deutsch (1958, 1960a) made was to induce participants toward
one of three motivational orientations through differing sets of instructions. Participants in
the cooperative orientation were led to feel concerned not only for their own welfare but for
the welfare of the other person as well, and were led to believe this concern was mutual. In
the individualistic condition, participants were to be concerned only for their own welfare
without regard for the other person and were led to believe the other person also felt this
way. And in the competitive orientation, each participant was led to feel not only that he or
she wanted to do the best for themselves, but also to do better than the other player, and that
the other player had the same objectives.

Deutsch (1958, 1960a) found that the participants in the cooperative conditions were
very likely to make a cooperative choice that resulted in mutual gain, while in the
competitive condition participants rarely made the cooperative choice. In the individualistic
condition situational variables, such as whether communication was possible, whether
choices were made simultaneously or in sequence, and whether choices could be reversed
after learning what choice the partner had made, influenced whether participants tended to
make a cooperative or an uncooperative choice. When choices were made in sequence or
without communication, participants in the individualistic condition tended to act
competitively, but when there was communication and the ability to reverse one's choices
individualistic participants tended to act cooperatively. A cooperative orientation tended to
produce both trusting and trustworthy behavior even when situational factors such as the
inability to communicate or lack of knowledge of the other's choices made cooperation more
difficult. On the other hand, a competitive orientation made cooperation difficult, even when
situational factors might have facilitated cooperation, such as when communication was available or choices could be reversed.

Deutsch (1958) also tested the effect of an observer or third party on players’ choice strategies. When a third party (an accomplice of the experimenter) who acted in an obnoxious and irritating manner stood to collect any money lost by the participants due to non-cooperation, there was a tendency to increase the number of cooperative choices. When the third party was present only as an observer the number of cooperative choices increased as well but not as dramatically.

Without honest communication Deutsch (1958) found that once two players had made choices that were out of step, that is, one choosing cooperatively and the other not, it was extremely difficult for them to get together again. Deutsch proposed that two conditions must be met for cooperation to be maintained in a stable on-going system. Each person must have a way of reacting to violations, a credible threat, which is known to the other and which can serve to inhibit violations. And the system must have a method of absolution to restore cooperative relations once lost. Deutsch reasoned that in any on-going system violations are likely to occur, if only by chance, but the system of interchange will break down if violations are frequent and go unchecked.

Deutsch’s work set off an avalanche of experiments using the prisoner’s dilemma or mixed-motive games. It has been estimated that, before they began to wane in popularity in the early 1980's, over 2,000 studies were conducted using these games (Dawes, Van de Kragt, & Orbell, 1990). Many of these studies were used to test the tenets of Osgood’s Graduated Reciprocal Initiatives for Tension Reduction (GRIT) proposal for breaking the
cycle of suspicion and tension that had led to the arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The Osgood Proposal. Osgood (1959) observed that trust was fundamental to cooperation, and yet trust could be difficult to establish once a cycle of suspicion, competition, and retaliation had begun. Lindskold (1978) described this process,

If the other party is suspected of harboring exploitative intentions, competition becomes the necessary response to defend against them. Such action, of course, serves to justify the suspicions of the other party that the first is being exploitative. An escalating cycle of distrust and competition occurs. If the other party could only be trusted to be cooperative in search of the mutually beneficial solution, then the cycle could be reversed, and both parties could gain rather than lose. (pp. 772-773)

Without trust, negotiating a bilateral agreement to reverse this escalating cycle was unlikely. Osgood proposed that, even in the midst of such tension and conflict, trust could be fostered through the conciliatory initiatives of one party acting unilaterally signaling the desire to establish trust without sacrificing genuine security interests. The proposal is quite simple. To overcome distrust one party announces a clear, conciliatory initiative and carries it out reliably. This is followed by an explicit invitation (but not a demand) to reciprocate. If after several conciliatory attempts the other party remains hostile, the first party matches their actions one for one, being careful not to overreact. A number of studies ensued to test the various theses and steps of the GRIT proposal.

Establishing trust. If we are to understand trust, it would be useful sought to explore what actions are required to establish trust. Swinth (1967) demonstrated that trust was established through a commitment period in which each partner had the opportunity to signal to the other a willingness to accept personal risk and not to exploit the vulnerability of the
other for personal gain. Players in a mixed-motive game could establish trust in a minimum of two moves if each had an opportunity to make a choice that involved putting themselves at risk for personal loss, and of having the opportunity to exploit the other and choosing not to. If the opportunity to be both vulnerable and benevolent were not simultaneously present the commitment period would take four moves. He explained,

First, one person chose the alternative in which he exposed himself to the risk of a personal loss, rather than an alternative in which he risked nothing. Then the second person chose the alternative which did not cause a loss to the first. If the second also forewent a personal gain in doing so, trust was immediately established; if he did not, it was necessary that he subsequently expose himself and that the other person respond with acceptance [rather than exploitation]. When participants engaged in this commitment process, trust followed, and when they did not, there was no trust. (p. 343)

Until each of the parties had both willingly placed themselves in a position of vulnerability to the other party, and had had the opportunity to exploit the other party and chosen not to, trust was not established.

Power. What effect does differential power have on the development of trust relationships? Soloman (1960) modified Deutsch’s game using various payoff schemes to simulate different power relationships between the participant and his or her opponent. Two conditions involved an opponent with absolute power in that the choice made by the opponent determined the payoff received by the participant. In one condition the interests were coordinated in that the opponent’s payoff was the same no matter which choice was made. In a second condition the interests were divergent in that the opponent could have a larger payoff if he or she exploited the participant. Under the partial power condition the participant had a measure of retaliatory power in that he or she could choose such that the
payoff for the opponent was diminished. In the equal power condition the participant had greater incentive to choose the uncooperative move because his or her payoff was greater if the opponent chose cooperatively (as in the typical PD game).

The opponents played using one of three preprogrammed game strategies: unconditional cooperation in which the opponent always made a cooperative choice regardless of the participant’s choice; conditional cooperation in which the opponent made a cooperative choice on the first move but thereafter matched whatever choice the participant made; and non-cooperation in which the opponent made the exploitative choice regardless of the participant’s choice. Participants were more likely to make the cooperative choice when they had more power relative to their opponents. However, in situations of equal power participants tended to respond to an unconditionally cooperative opponent with exploitative game behavior. The conditionally cooperative opponent, under conditions of high mutual interdependence, was likely to produce the greatest amount of cooperative behavior.

Credible threats. Deutsch (1958) suggested that it was necessary for each participant in an on-going relationship to have a credible threat, a way of responding to violations in order for trust to be sustained. In the PD games, an unconditional strategy of cooperation tended to be exploited, especially when there was no way for the cooperative player to retaliate for violation (Soloman, 1960; Lindskold & Bennett, 1973). However, when the highly cooperative player demonstrated a willingness on even a single occasion to retaliate for broken trust the other player tended to respond cooperatively to preserve the possibility of mutual gain. Therefore, the maintenance of a relatively unused threat capability had the effect of enhancing both the participant’s credibility in terms of attributions of trustworthy
intentions and the cooperative behavior of the participant (Lindskold & Bennett, pp. 184-185).

**Promises.** One of the key components of the Osgood proposal was the use of announcements in building a mutually cooperative strategy. Several studies tested the impact of communication on the establishment of a cooperative, mutually beneficial strategy (trust). Deutsch (1958) found that trust was much harder to establish in the absence of communication, but that communication was not always used honestly in a competitive situation. Participants with a competitive orientation frequently used communication deceptively to exploit the opponent. Participants who received dishonest communication were likely to become evasive in their own communication. However, when honest prior announcements of cooperative intentions were made they induced in the partner greater reciprocation of promises of cooperative intentions, greater reciprocation of honesty, and greater actual cooperation than did the dishonest announcement of cooperative intentions (Schlenker, Helm, & Tedeschi, 1973, p. 425). When a unilateral promise was backed up with a penalty if the promise was broken, cooperation was more likely than when no promise was made; and even if there were no penalty for breaking promises, participants who received a promise rated the opponent more trustworthy than when no promise was made (Evans, 1964).

One version of the PD game that simulated the arms race, with participants choosing either to convert factories to missiles or vice-versa. In this game, strategies of either matching tit-for-tat the participant’s strategy or a conciliatory strategy in which the opponent showed one fewer missile on any trial than the participant had shown on the previous round,
were the most effective in inducing cooperation regardless of whether or not there were prior announcements. However, a combination of a conciliatory strategy with honest prior announcements was the most effective in inducing reciprocal trust (Pilisuk, & Skolnick, 1968). These studies lend support to the contention of the Osgood proposal that honest prior announcement would be helpful in kindling trust and cooperation (Lindskold, 1978).

Validity of studying trust as a game. Despite the fruitfulness of these studies using mixed-motive games in supporting the tenets of the Osgood proposal, several researchers have questioned the validity of inferring trust and suspicion on the basis of observing participants’ choice to cooperate or compete in a mixed-motive game (Dawes, et al., 1990; Fisher & Brown, 1988; Rotter, 1967). In defending the use of the games, researchers have reported that people were engaged enough in the game to report affective responses to the situations, either anger or betrayal (Deutsch, 1958) or liking or disliking (Soloman, 1960) in response to the game strategy of the other player. Reactions as far as people’s behavior or feeling were concerned tended to be the same whether the rewards were imaginary or real (Evans, 1964; Wrightsman, 1966). However, an emotional response on the part of players is not necessarily evidence that the games are a valid measure of people’s true behavior because people have affective responses to competitive games as well as to real-life situations of betrayal or trust.

Rotter (1971) complained that the participants in PD games reacted to the situation as a competitive game rather than an opportunity to be trusting or trustworthy, even when they were given special instructions to encourage them away from such an orientation. He stated specifically that “interpersonal trust does not extend to a willingness to believe in the
benevolence of others in competitive situations” (p. 659). A person’s competitive or cooperative behavior in a game situation may be of little predictive value concerning that person’s trustworthiness in interpersonal relationships. A person may be intensely competitive and utilize all exploitative means within the rules of fair play of a sport or game and still be highly trustworthy when it comes to familial or work relationships. Or a person may be cleverly cooperative in a game of monopoly and nonetheless be dishonest or exploitative of coworkers or friends.

In the PD games the opponent was a stranger who was often an accomplice of the experimenter or even an imaginary person played by a machine and whose play was frequently prescribed by a preordained strategy. The intentions of the other party had to be inferred from their behavior or from highly constrained communication. Although these conditions were believed to be faithful on some level to situations arising in foreign policy, they are not true to the conditions of most interpersonal relationships. Most relationships in which trust is of interest are on-going relationships, and most take place in a social context where the consequences of untrustworthy behavior extend beyond the effects in the immediate situation.

Another criticism waged by Kee and Knox (1970) was that the element of time usually implicit in relationships involving trust and suspicion was not faithfully reproduced in the PD games, especially in the simultaneous choice or single trial games. Deutsch (1958) insisted that the choices of the players must be “psychologically simultaneous,” however, Kee and Knox pointed out that most situations of trust and suspicion involve a sequence of events in which a person must take action unilaterally at a time prior to finding out whether
his or her vulnerability has been betrayed (p. 363). A second criticism launched by Kee and Knox was that the dichotomous choices participants were forced to make in the PD games were not helpful in trying to determine the subjective probability the participant had made that the other player would be trustworthy. How much confidence must a player have of the other player’s cooperation before deciding to take the risk of cooperation? Kee and Knox commented that “it would be of interest to know at which point or threshold subjective trust becomes manifest as behavioral trust, ... the threshold will undoubtedly vary with a variety of situational, structural, and/or dispositional factors, such as incentives or [the participant’s] own trustworthiness” (p. 362).

The findings of Deutsch and the researchers who followed him in using PD games as a means of studying trust may be of greater value in understanding the kinds of relationships that emerge in foreign relations and diplomacy than for understanding on-going interpersonal relationships. Nonetheless, the studies have value for the interest they brought to the study of trust and demonstrating the practical value of such studies.

**Generalized Trust**

The late 1960’s was a time of great social upheaval, particularly on college campuses where a generation of disillusioned young adults regarded the institutions and authorities of society with suspicion. A decade after Deutsch published his groundbreaking work on the study of trust, Rotter (1967) put forth a different conceptualization of trust as an element in social learning theory. In this theory, trust was seen as a generalized personality trait rather than as the willingness to make one’s self vulnerable to exploitation in a situation where one
had something to gain by cooperation, but even more to lose if the other person proved untrustworthy.

Trust as a trait. Rotter (1967) predicted that people’s history of experiences where others had either fulfilled or broken promises would vary from one person to another and that expectations growing out of these histories would generalize from one societal actor to another (i.e. from one’s parents to teachers, doctors, the media, etc.). A child whose parents had been consistent would grow up to be generally trusting, while a child who had been regularly disappointed by broken promises would grow up with a generalized suspicion of people’s motives and promises.

Rotter (1967) developed a measure of trust, a paper-and-pencil questionnaire that asked participants to make judgments about the trustworthiness of a variety of social actors, including, politicians, the media, parents, and people in general. Rotter (1980) defined trust as believing others in the absence of clear-cut reasons to disbelieve, and predicted that people would have a generalized tendency either to believe or disbelieve others. Some feared that people with a high sense of generalized trust would be more likely to be gullible (defined as naivete or foolishness), and exhibit what Deutsch (1958) called “pathological trust.” Rotter found that high trusters were not more gullible than low trusters. Although high trusters were more likely to make a cooperative initial move in a PD game, they did not continue to trust once they had been tricked. It was evident that people, regardless of their generalized trust stance, were able to make use of information in a given situation and about the behavior of people in that situation.
Related personality traits. One of the most consistent findings about people with a trusting disposition was that they were much more likely to be trustworthy than others, even when they could increase their gain by being untrustworthy; and suspicious people had a greater tendency to be untrustworthy in their choices (Deutsch, 1958, 1960b; Rotter, 1980; Wrightsman, 1974). People who scored high in trusting on Rotter’s (1967) trust measure were more likely to be honest in other ways as well. They were less likely to lie and there was some evidence that they were less likely to cheat or steal as well (Rotter, 1980). High trusters seemed to be happier, to be more popular, and to be considered a better friend than low trusters; moreover, they were less likely to be conflicted, maladjusted or dependent on others (Rotter, 1980; Wrightsman, 1974). High trusters tended to have a more optimistic view of human nature as measured by Wrightsman’s Philosophies of Human Nature (Deutsch, 1960b; Wrightsman, 1966). Deutsch (1960b) found that low trusters tended to score high on a measure of an authoritarian personality and tended to be “less intellectually sophisticated, less liberal in their political views, more cynical concerning human nature, more prejudiced toward minority groups, and to have experienced and to favor stricter child rearing practices” (p. 140).

Situation-specific trust. Rotter’s theory was criticized on the grounds that a generalized expectancy of trust had not been found to be very predictive of trusting behavior in given situations. For example, when the proportion of broken promises were varied in a PD game, the situational variable of promise credibility produced much stronger effects on participants’ cooperative behavior than did the personality variable of trust (measured using Rotter’s Interpersonal Trust Scale), which produced only marginally significant effects.
(Schlenker, Helm, & Tedeschi, 1973, p. 425). When participants were placed in trust building T-groups, both attitudinal and situational factors played a role in interpersonal trust, but situational factors were significantly more important (Scott, 1989). When behavioral measures of trust were used, generalized trust was related to the number of seconds it took for a person to fall backwards into the arms of a waiting partner but was not related to the willingness to disclose personal information to a stranger (Cash, Stack, & Luna, 1975).

Rotter (1971) himself asserted that situational factors could be expected to play a role in people’s behavior, especially in situations that were familiar to them. He noted, “The more novel the situation, the greater weight generalized expectancies have....The situation partially determines the response, and the theory predicts that situations of considerable familiarity are less predictable from a generalized expectancy than those involving more novelty” (p. 445). What this explanation missed was that most of the experimental situations in which trust had been tested were novel situations for the participants and generalized trust was still not very predictive. Scott (1980) attempted to integrate generalized and situation-specific aspects of trust in the following way.

Therefore, it could be concluded that interpersonal trust is an attitude in the classical sense; determined by a generalized affective component towards the class of which the trust object is a member. Then it is modified by the cognitive component which narrows the scope of the attitude to a specific trust object with unique characteristics within the class. Finally, it is acted upon in a certain way depending upon the importance of the situation, the stakes or consequences, timing, etc. (p. 812)

These early studies laid the groundwork for the study of trust, establishing its importance and its complexity. Deutsch (1958) and Rotter’s (1967) early definitions of trust have been
influential but a variety of other definitions have emerged as well. It is difficult to move forward with the study of the construct without first clarifying what is meant by trust.

Elements of Trust

Trust has been hard to define because it is a complex concept. There seem to be almost as many definitions of trust as there are articles on the subject. Not only are different elements or dimensions included in various definitions of trust, but sets of different kinds of trust are proposed as well.

There seems to be a growing consensus that trust is a multidimensional construct; however, researchers have varied in which elements they have emphasized or included in their definitions. An extensive review of over 150 articles spanning the last four decades revealed a wide variety of definitions of trust, as well as the dimensions included. Table 2.1 compares different definitions of trust along seven of the most common elements included in definitions of trust.

Risk

What is common across definitions of trust, either explicitly or implicitly, is vulnerability. Where there is no vulnerability there is no need for trust. There is less consensus about whether trust lies in the choice or action that increases one's vulnerability, or in the degree of optimism or positive expectation one must hold in order to describe an action or attitude as trusting. Trust is both a noun and a verb. In defining trust for study should we focus on people's behavior in a situation of vulnerability, or on their attitudes or the degree of confidence held? For example, when a parent leaves his or her child with a child care provider but with significant misgivings, can the parent be said to have trusted the
provider? By taking action the parent has increased his or her vulnerability to possible negative outcomes, however, he or she has done so with a certain level of anxiety. Deutsch (1960a) pointed out that when a person makes a move that increases his or her vulnerability to another person it could be hard to infer the motivation for such a choice. The decision to place oneself at risk to another could be based on "despair, conformity, impulsivity, innocence, virtue, faith, masochism, or confidence" (p. 124). Although the behavior of the parent who anxiously left their child with a child care provider was no different than that of a parent with no misgivings, the level of trust is very different.

Predictability

At its most basic level trust has to do with predictability. It has to do with consistency of behavior and knowing what to expect from others. When we say that we trust other drivers to drive on the proper side of the road or that we trust a restaurant to provide us with food that is safe, we mean that these things are predictable. We don’t have to question whether they will continue to be so. In and of itself, however, predictability is unsatisfying as a definition of trust. We can trust a person to be invariably late. Or we can count on a someone to be consistently malicious, self-serving or dishonest. When our well being is diminished or damaged in a predictable way, our expectations may be met but the sense in which we trust the other person or group is weak.

Benevolence

The most common dimension of trust is a sense of benevolence, the confidence that one’s well-being, or something one cares about, will be protected and not harmed by the trusted person or group. One can count on the good will of the other to act in one’s best
interest. In an ongoing relationship the future actions or deeds may not be specified but only that there will be a mutual attitude of good will. Trust is the assurance that the other will not exploit one’s vulnerability or take excessive advantage of one even when the opportunity is available (Cummings & Bromily, 1996, p. 4). It is the “accepted vulnerability to another’s possible but not expected ill will” (Baier, 1986, p. 236). In situations of interdependence this faith in the altruism of the other is particularly important.

Reliability

Reliability, or dependability, combines predictability and benevolence. In a situation of interdependence, when something is required from another person or group, they can be counted on to supply it. What is required might be something tangible e.g., raw materials from a supplier or intangible, e.g., a sense of concern and a listening ear in a time of distress. There is a sense of confidence that one’s needs will be met and that one need not be anxious wondering if the person will come through. One aspect of trust is the element of time (Kee & Knox, 1970). Most interactions do not take place simultaneously but unfold over a matter of time. There is a lag between when a commitment is made and when the recipient knows that it has been fulfilled. If it were not for some uncertainty in some future time, what assurance would a promise bring? The degree to which a person can rest in that uncertainty with a certain amount of confidence is the degree to which that person can be said to trust.

Competence

These are times when good intentions are not enough. When a person is dependent on another and some level of skill is involved in fulfilling an expectation, then a person who means well may nonetheless not be trusted. For example, the patient of a young surgeon may
feel that this doctor wishes very much to heal the patient, but if he or she has performed very few of this particular surgery or if the outcome of a previous patient was not good, the patient may not feel a great deal of trust in the physician. Many of the situations in which we speak about trust in an organizational context have to do with competence. In a work context, if a person’s or team’s project depends on components of another person or team, they may or may not feel an “assured confidence” that the deadlines will be met or that the products will be of adequate quality to complete the project.

**Honesty**

Honesty speaks to the person’s character, of integrity and authenticity. Rotter (1967) defined trust as the expectancy that the word, promise, verbal or written statement of another individual or group can be relied upon (p. 651). The implication was that the statements made were truthful and conformed to “what really happened” at least from that person’s perspective, and that commitments made about future actions would be kept. A correspondence between a person’s statements and deeds characterizes integrity. An acceptance of responsibility for one’s actions and avoiding distorting the truth in order to shift blame to another characterizes authenticity.

**Openness**

Openness is important in two ways. The first is that important or relevant information is not withheld. The second has to do with the way a person makes himself or herself vulnerable by sharing personal information with others, a giving of self. This openness signals a kind of reciprocal trust, a confidence that the information will not be exploited and that the recipient can feel the same confidence in return. People who are guarded in the
information they share provoke suspicion in return; people wonder what is being hidden and why. Distrust breeds distrust, and people who are unwilling to extend trust through openness end up living in isolated prisons of their own making (Kramer, Brewer, & Hanna, 1996).

**Affection**

Some researchers have included affection, or liking, as a dimension of trust, while others have simply found relationships between trust and affection. McAllister (1995) distinguished cognition-based trust from affect-based trust, and Lewis and Weigert (1985) also acknowledged that there were affective foundations for trust that consisted of the emotional bonds between individuals. McAllister (1995) explained, “People make emotional investments in trust relationships, express genuine care and concern for the welfare of partners, believe in the intrinsic value of such relationships, and believe that these sentiments are reciprocated” (p. 26). McAllister used a five-item scale to assess affect-based trust between co-workers, however the items seem to address affection or friendship in a working relationship but not necessarily trust. Respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement with statements such as,

- We would both feel a sense of loss if one of us was transferred, and
- We have a sharing relationship.

Other items assessed the level of emotional investment in the working relationship or the ability to share difficulties with the confidence that the other person would be willing to listen. What McAllister (1995) called cognition-based trust bears more similarity to elements usually associated with trust. Judgments are made about the person’s reliability or competence or whether “most people...trust and respect him/her as a coworker.”
McAllister (1995) asserted that “each form of trust functions in a unique manner and has a distinct pattern of association to antecedent and consequent variables” (p. 51). However, what he seemed to have demonstrated was that trust is distinct from affection or liking, and that each operates independently within a relationship. This distinction was borne out by Gabarro (1978) who in a study of CEOs and their subordinates, found that friendship followed the establishment of trust. In some cases trust, based on competence, good judgment or reliability, was maintained in spite of personal dislike.

Several studies have found a correlation between trust and liking, especially where the dimension of benevolence has been assessed (Deutsch, 1958; Rotter, 1967), but affection does not seem to be necessary for trust to develop. Participants were found to have less liking for a opponent who chose an unconditionally cooperative strategy than for one with a conditionally cooperative strategy (Soloman, 1960). Participants reported not understanding the motives of the unconditionally cooperative player and therefore liked them less. Johnson-George and Swap (1982) recognized affection as a separate construct from trust and in testing their measure of trust used loving and liking items to establish the discriminant validity of the trust items. Consequently, affection was not included in the definition of trust used in this research.

**Thresholds**

Several questions relate to the dimensions of trust. How much confidence is required to call an attitude trust? Is it necessary to have a high level of confidence in all dimensions in order to say there is trust? Shaw (1997) suggested that there is a crucial threshold across which trust turns to distrust. However, different elements may have different thresholds
depending on the level of reliance in that area and the consequences of one's expectations not being met. In Gabarro's (1978) descriptions of leaders and subordinates, after a period of getting acquainted the relationship seemed to stabilize and people tended to have a sense of which areas a person could be relied upon and in which he could not. In such a setting, the bottom line was competence. If the CEO did not develop a confidence in a subordinate's competence within the first few months, it was unlikely that subordinate would remain with the company. Lindskold (1978) suggested that if a person's actions and intentions are perceived as benevolent, even if that person's credibility is less than perfect, he or she can be trusted. When trust is defined behaviorally the pertinent threshold is when a person willingly places himself or herself in a position of vulnerability to another person.

**One Trust or Many?**

In addition to the many dimensions of trust, the study of trust is complicated by the dynamic nature of trust. Trust can have different bases depending on the nature of the dependence one has in another. One is differentially vulnerable to an intimate friend, a boss, an airline pilot, or a surgeon. Trust also changes over the course of a relationship as trust grows or deepens over time. One way that researchers have devised to cope with the complexity of dimensions and dynamics of trust has been to name different *kinds* of trust, distinguished by the different elements on which they are based. Lewicki and Bunker (1996) delineated three *stages* of trust development, while Zucker (1986) and Sako (1991) each identified three *bases* of trust within and between organizations. Kramer, Brewer, and Hanna (1996) described three trust *processes* that operate within a collective to maintain trust within and on behalf of the group.
Lewicki and Bunker (1996) described trust as a dynamic phenomenon that takes on a different character at different stages of a relationship. They observed the ways that trust grew and changed over time as the parties got to know one another and came to have a greater understanding and empathy for one another’s purposes. As a relationship develops, trust “thickens” (Gambetta, 1988) and takes on more dimensions at a deeper level or greater degree of confidence. The three stages described by Lewicki and Bunker were:

- Deterrence-based trust
- Knowledge-based trust
- Identification-based trust

At the start of a relationship the trust that exists is a provisional trust resting on the assumption that the other party desires to maintain the relationship, and that a breach of expectations will result in a severing of that tie. In deterrence-based trust individuals accept a certain level of vulnerability based on the belief that the potential costs of discontinuing the relationship outweigh the short-term advantages of acting in an untrustworthy way. This kind of trust is strengthened when the deterrent or punishment available if either party breaks trust is clear, possible, and likely to occur (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996, p. 119). This deterrence-based trust will remain the default value in an ongoing relationship if continued contact and communication do not result in increased trust.

Because the cost of these sanctions exceeds the potential benefits that opportunistic behavior may provide, even based on strictly utilitarian motives it is to a party’s benefit to behave in a trustworthy manner (Gulati, 1995). Williamson (1975, 1993) called this kind of trust “calculative trust” because it is based on calculations of the relative costs of maintaining
or severing the relationship. He argued that calculative trust is the only kind of trust it makes sense to talk about in a business context. Even if there seem to be other bases for trusting or cooperative relationships between businesses, such as a close network of interpersonal relationships or a long-standing history of business dealings, the behavior can nonetheless be explained in utilitarian terms.

Knowledge-based trust takes root as actors get to know one another and come to feel able to predict how the other is likely to behave in a given situation. It involves understanding and predictability. Knowledge-based trust grows through regular communication and actively researching one’s partner. A kind of courtship takes place in which each party is careful not to violate the other’s developing trust (Shapiro, Sheppard, & Cheraskin, 1992). The more points of contact parties have, the better the chances they will come to understand and be able to predict each others’ behavior (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996).

As a relationship matures further, the possibility for a deep identification between partners emerges. The third stage of trust, identification-based trust, exists when each of the parties effectively understands and appreciates the other’s wants. There is complete empathy with the other party’s desires and intentions. When identification-based trust has developed this mutual understanding is such that each can effectively act in each other’s stead (Lewicki & Bunker).

Sheppard and Tuchinsky (1996) affirmed these three levels of trust but insisted that all three levels must hold for trust to be present in a business relationship. They argued that “You can trust in a business when three conditions hold: (a) They risk losing too much if they cheat [deterrence-based trust], (b) you can predict your partners well and thus can
protect against their cheating [knowledge-based trust], and (c) your partners have adopted your preferences [identification-based trust]” (pp. 143).

Zucker (1986) was interested in the bases of trust within society as a whole. She noticed different bases of trust, depending on the nature of the ties between people. She highlighted three different means by which trust was cultivated between people—

- process-based trust
- character-based trust
- institution-based trust

Process-based trust develops as a result of the quality of the social exchanges between people. It emerges either through the personal experience of recurring interactions or in expectations based on reputation. Reciprocity is at the heart of this process, and the expectation that good will will be returned in kind. Characteristic-based trust describes the inclination people have to extend trust more readily to those they view as similar to themselves. It is based on norms of obligation and cooperation rooted in social similarity, where similarity may depend on characteristics such as family background, social status, or ethnicity. This trust may perpetuate itself through “a positive self-reinforcing process of interaction” (Creed & Miles, 1996, p. 18). Institution-based trust is less personal and instead is tied to formal social structures that confer trust, such as having a license or certification to practice a profession, or where trust is supported by mechanisms such as escrow accounts, insurance or contracts.
Sako (1991) examined trust as it arose within the context of business dealings. She described three different kinds of trust that each highlight a different dimension of trust. Each is relevant depending on the nature of one party's reliance on another.

- Competence trust
- Contractual trust
- Goodwill trust

Competence trust concerns the expectation of a trading partner performing his or her role competently. Particularly when one's reliance on another depends on the exercise of skill, confidence in the other's competence will be important.

Contractual trust exists such that each partner adheres to agreements and keeps promises. This is similar to the first two elements in Cummings and Bromily's (1996) definition of trust: the belief that another individual or group (a) makes good-faith efforts to behave in accordance with any commitments both explicit or implicit, (b) is honest in whatever negotiations preceded such commitments.

The third element in Cummings and Bromily's definition, that the other will not take excessive advantage of another even when the opportunity is available, reflects Sako's goodwill trust. Dogson (1993) described goodwill trust as the "mutual expectation of open commitment to each other" (p. 83). Sako (1991) described some of the advantages of goodwill trust, "Someone who is worthy of 'goodwill trust' is dependable and can be credited with high discretion, as he can be expected to take initiative while refraining from unfair advantage taking" (p. 379). High trust in business dealing would include all three of
these kinds of trust: respect for one’s partner’s abilities, openness and honesty in commitments, and expectations of mutual benefit or good will (Dogson, 1993, p. 92).

Kramer, Brewer, and Hanna (1996) recognized that trust operates not only between individuals, but also within and between groups. They were interested in how trust was cultivated in a collective and identified three processes of trust that serve to maintain solidarity and sustain trust in a group. These were:

- elicitative trust
- compensatory trust
- moralistic trust

In elicitative or reciprocity-based trust one takes the initiative to make oneself vulnerable with the hope that it will build more trust in the collective. Behavior is motivated by the belief or expectation that, by engaging in acts of trust oneself, one may be able to induce others to do the same (Kramer, Brewer, & Hanna, 1996). Horsburgh (1960) called this “therapeutic trust” and defined it as a reliance aimed at increasing the trustworthiness of the person in whom it is placed. He explained, “Such trust is based on a belief in the possibility of stirring someone’s conscious to an extent sufficient to affect his or her conduct” (p. 352). When engaging in compensatory trust individuals are willing to engage in actions to offset the behavior of other individuals they think might threaten the stability or survival of the collective trust. Moralistic trust emphasizes the beliefs held by members of a collective about what responsible membership in a social group entails.
Measures of Trust

It is not surprising, with so many definitions of trust, that there would be a profusion of ways that trust has been measured. As in the definitions, each emphasizes different elements or dimensions of trust. Early measures of trust were behavioral. These measures posited trust as a characteristic of a person, and looked at trust reactions in interactions with strangers. In addition to framing trust as making a cooperative move in a mixed-motive game (Deutsch, 1958), trust was also measured as the number of seconds a person would wait before falling backwards into the arms of a partner, or the willingness to disclose personal information either to a stranger (Cash, Stack, & Luna, 1975) or a group of strangers who had participated in trust-building exercises (Scott, 1989). As conceptions of trust became more specific, measures of trust shifted in focus to the relationships between specific persons. Behavioral measures were replaced by paper-and-pencil questionnaires, usually asking for respondents’ level of agreement with a series of statements. The referents of these scales has varied, from generalized judgments about “people in general” or various social actors (Heretick, 1981; Rotter, 1967), or to a specific intimate partner (Johnson-George & Swap, 1982; Larzelere & Huston, 1989; Rempel, Holmes, & Zanna, 1985).

In the past two decades the study of trust has focused on relationships within organizations. The hierarchical nature of relationships in a work setting complicates the study of trust because it affects the expectations of what people feel they owe to one another. Trust between and within organizational levels has been examined. Researchers have measured workers’ trust in their employer (Gabarro & Athos, 1976), while others have examined both trust in peers in the workplace and in management (Cook & Wall, 1980; Hoy
the work unit, immediate supervisor, top management, and trust in an organizational
consultant. Cummings and Bromily (1996) measured trust between departments or units in
an organization.

The aspects of trust these measures have sought to capture have also varied. Gabarro
and Athos (1976) solicited opinions about an employer’s integrity, fairness, consistency,
honesty, openness, intentions and overall trust, while Cook and Wall (1980) measured just
two determinants: reliability, and capability (competence). Shaw (1997) measured four
conditions of trust in a workplace as the extent to which it exhibited trust (risk), achieved
results (competence), acted with integrity (honesty), and demonstrated concern
(benevolence). Cummings and Bromily (1996) included three elements: keeps commitments
(reliability); negotiates honestly (honesty); and avoids taking excessive advantage
(benevolence), while DeFuria (1997) assessed ten sources of organizational trust. Table 2.2
provides sample items of these various measures of trust.

Coping with the complexity of trust has been a challenge for all who would study the
construct. One must deal not only with a multiplicity of dimensions of trust, but of a dynamic
process that changes over time with the kinds of reliance and expectations one has in another.
For purposes of this research an adaptation of previous multidimensional definitions of trust
is used: Trust is one party’s willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the
confidence that the latter party is (a) benevolent, (b) reliable, (c) competent, (d) honest, and
(e) open (adapted from Butler & Cantrell, 1984, and Mishra, 1996).
Dynamics of Trust

Studying trust is difficult it is a dynamic process. The nature of a trusting relationship can be altered instantaneously with a simple comment, a betrayed confidence, or a decision that violates the sense of care one has expected of another. When trust breaks down it can either be repaired or distrust will come to characterize the relationship. In addition, most relationships of trust do not take place in a vacuum; they are embedded in social contexts that impose constraints, values, and sanctions that affect the trust relationship. An understanding of the dynamic quality of trust is essential to understanding the construct.

Betrayal, Revenge, and Repair

Vulnerability in a matter of importance or value to the trusting person is assumed by most definitions of trust. Mishra (1996) asserted that “Trust by its very nature provides opportunities for malfeasance on the part of those being trusted” (p. 265). Without vulnerability, it is hard to describe a situation as involving trust because the outcomes are inconsequential for the one doing the trusting. Situations inevitably arise when the thing cared for is harmed (even if by accident) or vulnerability is exploited for the gain of the trusted at the expense of the one who has extended trust.

Broken trust. Trust involves placing with some level of confidence or assurance something one cares about in the care or control of another. At least in part, the outcome one desires is determined by someone else. But what if one’s expectations are not met? What if the one who is trusted acts opportunistically, taking advantage of the confidence that was placed in him or her? Although trust is extended incrementally, when a violation occurs trust is often shattered, leaving distrust in its place (Burt & Knez, 1996). When such a violation
occurs it can leave the victim feeling stunned and confused, and with a sense of unreality that in time turns to anger or even rage (Bies & Tripp, 1996; Govier, 1992).

Bies and Tripp (1996) classify trust violations within organizations as stemming from two broad categories: a damaged sense of civic order or a damaged identity. The trust violations they identified that resulted in a damaged sense of civic order had to do with a breach of rules or norms governing behavior and what people owed to one another in a relationship. These included honor violations such as broken promises, lying, shirking of job responsibilities, stealing ideas or credit from others, or the disclosure of private confidences and secrets. A damaged sense of civic order could also result from abusive authority where a boss was intolerable or corrupt. Trust violations that resulted in a damaged identity included public criticism, wrong or unfair accusations, or insults to one’s self or the collective of which one was a part.

The effects of psychological contract breach on employee’s performance and intention to stay with an employer were explored by Robinson (1996). A psychological contract was defined as an individual’s beliefs about the terms and conditions of a reciprocal exchange agreement between that person and another party (Rouseau, 1989), that is, an employee’s perceptions of what they owed to their employers and what their employers owed them. Robinson defined psychological contract breach as the extent to which an employer had failed to fulfill promises regarding such issues as high salary, promotions and advancement, pay based on performance, long-term job security, sufficient power and responsibility, and training and career development. Broken promises resulted in both a loss of trust and disappointment about unmet expectations. The loss of trust was a critical
ingredient moderating the relationship between psychological contract breach and subsequent employee reactions. When broken promises led to lost trust, distrust was significantly related to a deterioration in the employee’s performance and to intentions to leave the employer.

Distrust. Broken trust can lead to an ongoing sense of distrust in a relationship. Distrust may result from a failure of trust to develop in a relationship in the first place, from the gradual undermining of trust through a number of relatively minor events or from a catastrophic shattering of trust through a major breach. Barber (1983) points out that distrust is not necessarily an irrational or unwise response but it may be based on knowledge, experience and a real difference in values. Distrust tends to be accompanied by feelings of anxiety and insecurity, causing people to feel uncomfortable and ill at ease, and provoking them to expend energy on assessing the actions and potential actions of others (Fuller, 1996; Govier, 1992). Reliance on a distrusted person will cause reluctance and discomfort. Although we sometimes have no choice but to rely on someone we distrust, those are situations we would prefer to avoid (Govier, 1992).

One of the most difficult things about distrust is that once it is established it has a strong tendency to be self-perpetuating.

[When we distrust someone, we regard even those acts and gestures which should be benign as sinister underneath. We systematically interpret what the other says and does so as to confirm our distrust, and suspiciousness builds on itself. Distrust impedes the communication which could overcome it....We see, describe, understand, explain, and predict the distrusted other in ways which confirm our distrust, so that suspiciousness builds on itself and our negative beliefs about the other tend in the worst case toward immunity to refutation by evidence. (Govier, 1992, p. 56)]

People may use various means to protect themselves from the possible harm of the distrusted person and to minimize their vulnerability. Whatever has provoked distrust, it will
cause the distrustful person to spend energy monitoring the behavior and possible motives of the other, watching to guard against further damage to the things one cares about. People may withhold information, use pretense or even deception to protect their interests (Bartolme, 1989; Govier, 1992; Mellinger, 1956). They may resort to alternative control mechanisms such as rules, contracts, and insurance. Although such steps may be necessary and important, they are “typically costly, partial, inefficient, and counterproductive to the relationships involved” (Govier, p. 56).

Trust has been distinguished from distrust in an organizational setting as springing from different sources. According to Sitkin and Roth (1993), trust has to do with task reliability, that is, that ability to meet expectations of job performance. Distrust, on the other hand, arises when an individual or group is perceived as not sharing key cultural values. When a person challenges an organization’s fundamental assumptions and values, that person may be perceived as operating under values so different from the group’s that the violator’s underlying world view becomes suspect (Gabarro, 1978; Lindskold, 1978). Threat of future violations of expectations arises because the person is now seen as a cultural outsider, one who “doesn’t think like us,” and may therefore, do the “unthinkable” (Sitkin & Roth, p. 371).

Revenge. Trust has to do with expectations of other people in situations of vulnerability. When those expectations are not met some kind of response is likely. Whether that response leads to the restoration of trust or to a further escalation of conflict depends on the choices made by the actors in the situation. When a violation of trust has occurred, the way the victim understands the cause of the violation will affect the likely response, and
specifically whether there is a desire for revenge. Among people recounting on-the-job experiences of violation, Bies and Tripp (1996) found that when a victim concluded that an action was outside the control of the perpetrator, revenge was not be sought; however, when the victim held the perpetrator responsible for the violation, there was always motivation for revenge. Blame was assigned and revenge sought when the victim perceived the behavior to have grown out of selfishness or malevolence on the part of the perpetrator. Victims also assigned responsibility to the system or organization as a whole for hiring or failing to constrain the perpetrator.

Revenge was not solely an emotional reaction to violation; cognitive processes played a prominent and mediating role in the seeking of revenge as well (Bies & Tripp, 1996). At the time a violation occurred, people reported having been stunned and confused as well as angry. Contrary to stereotypic notions of revenge, victims’ choice of revenge strategy was “cool and calculated,... it appeared to be quite rational in both deliberation and delivery” (p. 259). There was evidence, however, of “different arithmetics” between victim and perpetrator, each assessing the cost of the perceived damage differently. These different calculations, and the responses they evoked, played a role in the escalation process of a conflict. Upon reflection people were likely to “discover” more malevolence on the part of the perpetrators, thus enhancing blame, paranoid cognitions, and conspiracy theories that led victims to seek social support and reinforcement for their perceptions.

Victims considered a variety of responses to violation (Bies & Tripp, 1996). Some enjoyed indulging in revenge fantasies, while others either sparked or continued a self-perpetuating cycle of feuding. Some victims arranged for a private confrontation or sought
the restoration of their reputation. Others simply withdrew from any social contact with the person who had betrayed them or did nothing. Finally, some offered forgiveness. Bies and Tripp noted that there is power in forgiveness because the victim, not the perpetrator, restores trust. They also concluded that some harms appear to be irreversible -- trust is no longer a possibility in these circumstances.

Rather than seeing revenge in an altogether negative light, Bies and Tripp (1996) asserted that revenge can play a potentially positive role in organizational life. Not only can revenge act as a constraint against the abuse of power and injustice, it can also promote cooperation and be a potent motivator for constructive change. Revenge has a way of equalizing some of the power differential in organizations; it gives victims a choice of how to respond to a breach in trust and it gives them some control over if and when they will again offer their trust.

Trust repair. How can trust, once broken, be repaired? Will it forever be weaker than it was before it was broken or can it grow back stronger than it was to begin with? To be sure, trust repair can be a difficult and time-consuming process. It is a bilateral process in which each party must perceive that the short-term and/or long-term benefits to be derived from the relationship are highly enough valued to be worth the investment of time and energy required by the repair process. Each party must decide that the benefits of restoring the relationship are preferred to finding ways of having the needs that were fulfilled by the relationship met in another manner (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996).

Fisher and Brown (1988) suggested that even in situations of mutual distrust each side has the opportunity of improving the level of trust in the relationship. They noted that
there are many contexts in which we have to interact with individuals and groups of whose conduct we disapprove. Although relationships necessarily have two parties, it takes only one of these parties to change the quality of the relationship. To this end, Fisher and Brown recommended what they called “unconditionally constructive attitudes and actions.”

[These] attitudes and actions which will be beneficial whatever the actions of the other party. These include trying to understand the other side’s interests, attitudes and beliefs; taking an attitude of acceptance toward the other side; working for good communication; being meticulously reliable; and using persuasion rather than coercion. (Govier,1992, p. 60)

Fisher and Brown (1988) recommended against expecting reciprocity in relationships, because such expectations risk disillusionment or even escalation of the conflict. They pointed out that the tit-for-tat strategy that proved effective in the Prisoner’s Dilemma games does not work in most real-life situations because most relationships are not well-modeled by the constraints of the prisoner’s dilemma games. In real-life relationships whether an action is considered one of cooperation or defection is not always clear and may be an issue of dispute. An exact reciprocation may be hard to gauge because of the “different arithmetics” used by victims and perpetrators.

In trying to understand the other party and their motivations Fisher and Brown (1988) recommended that one assume that others do not see themselves as “bad people pursuing immoral ends through illegitimate means” but that they have what they consider good reasons for doing as they do. Fisher and Brown do not suggest blind trust, or extending trust beyond what is reasonable given the information available about the others’ actions and motivations, but they do maintain that each side has the opportunity to be completely trustworthy. Govier’s (1992) prescription for trustworthiness suggests a person should be “as
predictable as possible, speak carefully, especially when making commitments, treat promises seriously, and never be deceptive” (p. 61). Whether distrust has grown from hurt pride over a damaged sense of identity or disillusionment growing out of a damaged civic order or perceived value incongruence, attention will need to be paid to these issues in the restoration of trust (Sitkin & Stickel, 1996, p. 312).

The violator and the victim have different roles and responsibilities in the reestablishment of trust. Lewicki and Bunker (1996) argue that the violator must start by recognizing and acknowledging that a violation has occurred. Listening carefully to the victim, the violator then must determine the nature of the violation and admit to having caused the event. He or she must also admit that the act was destructive. Finally, the perpetrator must accept responsibility for the effects of his or her actions. These acknowledgments made, the victim then determines what is required to restore trust.

According to Lewicki and Bunker there are four alternative courses of trust repair:

- The victim refuses to accept any actions, terms, or conditions for reestablishing the relationship.
- The victim acknowledges forgiveness but specifies “unreasonable” acts of reparation
- The victim acknowledges forgiveness and specifies “reasonable” acts of reparation
- The victim simply acknowledges forgiveness and indicates that no further acts of reparation are necessary

The acts of reparation are usually designed to demonstrate that the violator is sincere and committed in the desire to rebuild the relationship, and to demonstrate a willingness to incur a certain amount of personal loss to do so. The victim then has the opportunity to judge
the sincerity and commitment of the violator in carrying out these actions. Reparations also create an opportunity for the violator to work out any guilt that he or she may have over the harm that was done, whether it was intentional or unintentional.

The Social Context of Trust

A reputation of trustworthiness is a valuable asset to individuals and businesses alike. Relationships within organizations tend to be on-going, in that people expect to continue to relate to the same network of people over time. When this is the case, there is incentive to behave in ways that are trustworthy, to develop a reputation for trustworthiness, and to reap the benefits of trusting relationships. The trust between two individuals or groups is significantly influenced by the social context in which that relationship is embedded. A network of mutual friends and acquaintances can enhance the likelihood that a trusting relationship will develop and will strengthen trust as it develops but such a context can also amplify the effects of a breach of trust. The judgment, observations, and gossip of others can tend to “lock in” relationships at positive and negative extremes (Burt & Knez, 1996). Individuals tend to be more alert to negative information and prefer negative gossip to positive. This can be an impediment to the development of trust. New technologies, such as e-mail, voice mail or the Internet, that allow the spread of gossip farther and faster can amplify the impact of broken trust.

Trust has been difficult to study, not only because it is a multi-dimensional construct, but it is a dynamic one as well. The importance of each of the elements depends on the referent of trust (who is being trusted) and the nature of the vulnerability between the parties. The nature of the vulnerability can change over the course of a relationship as the level of
interdependence increases or decreases. Trust depends on what one expects of another based on norms of behavior or role expectations. The quality of a trust relationship will also be affected by the network of social relationships in which it is embedded. Finally, relationships of trust ebb and flow as participants choose how to respond to instances of broken trust, either in engaging in the effort required to repair the relationship or to choose various forms of revenge.

**Trust in Hierarchical Relationships**

Baier (1986) complained that much of the philosophical work on trust and morality have been based on contractual relationships between people of roughly equal power. And yet the reality of life in organizations is that individuals are invested with varying degrees of power and authority. Baier finds these musings about trust which are based on assumptions of equal power inadequate for many social contexts. "For those whose daily dealings are with the less powerful or the more powerful, a moral code designed for those of equal power will be at best nonfunctional, at worst an offensive pretense of equality as a substitute for its actuality" (p. 249).

People at different organizational levels may look to one another with different expectations on which to build trust. Principals, for example, may evaluate the trustworthiness of teachers based on their ability to perform work competently, on judgments of teachers’ motivation and on the extent to which they perceive them to share key organizational values of the school (Gabarro, 1978; Kramer, 1996). Teachers, on the other hand, may be more likely to look for evidence of concern (benevolence) and for a willingness to share information (openness) as the bases of trust (Gabarro, 1978; Kramer,
1996). Both principals and teachers are likely to look for integrity or honesty in making trust judgments (Gabarro, 1978).

In a study of newly appointed company presidents and their key subordinates, Gabarro (1978) found that the presidents and subordinates used somewhat different criteria in making their trust judgments of the other. Although both found integrity to be important, the presidents were more concerned with the competence and consistency of behavior of subordinates, while subordinates placed more importance on motives and openness. Gabarro also found that the nature of trust became more differentiated over time. He noted that,

Appraisals of how much and in what ways one could trust another were based on an accumulation of interactions, specific incidents, problems and events... in which each person tacitly or explicitly tested and explored the ways and limits in which he could trust the other. ...By the end of twelve months both the presidents and their executives could give fairly detailed descriptions of those areas in which they trusted the other and those in which they did not. (p. 297)

In describing the stages of the development of working relationships, Gabarro found that in the beginning there was an initial period of impression making, followed by a period of more intense exploration. The exploration stage evolved into a third stage that was "characterized by tacit testing of the limits of trust and influence, and attempts to arrive at a mutual set of expectations" (p. 301). Most relationships that lasted for more than eighteen months became stable and underwent relatively little change thereafter.

Not only are there potentially different bases for trust across organizational levels, organizational actors at different levels may invest differential levels of importance on information gained through interactions. Kramer (1996) found that subordinates were hypervigilant in their trust assessments of superiors, and that even relatively minor gestures,
either positive or negative, took on considerable diagnostic import (p. 225). Subordinates were able to recall more trust related incidents than superiors, and trust violations were likely to “loom larger” than confirmations of trustworthiness.

In an experimental study of the effects on trust of surveillance by supervisors, Strickland (1958) found that when supervisors were constrained to monitor one of two “subordinates” more closely on the first set of trials, on the second trial when there was a choice of whom to monitor they also chose to more closely monitor that same subordinate. Although the performance of both had been equal, and had met or exceeded standards on all but one trial, supervisors also expressed greater trust of the less-monitored subordinate.

In another rather disturbing study, Kelley and Ring (1961) attempted to show that trainees under a “suspicious” training schedule would learn more and ultimately come to have a greater sense of control than those who were trained with a “trusting” training schedule. These authors wanted to show that under conditions where a trainer was not able to directly monitor the choices of a trainee that the trainee would be more likely to reveal his choice to the trainer who was “suspicious,” that is, who assumed an error for any unseen choice and consequently punished the trainee, than to a “trusting” trainer who assumed any unseen choice was correct. Subordinates did show their choices more readily to the “suspicious” trainer, and did come more readily into compliance with the criteria set by that trainer. However, there were both methodological and ethical problems with the experiment.

In the first place, the task was an ambiguous one. Subjects were asked to make a judgment between two statements as to which was indicative of greater psychopathology. Each card contained two statements, one indicating a depressive state and another a state of
anxiety. In half the cases the subjects were rewarded for choosing the depressive statements, and in the other half they were rewarded for choosing the anxiety statements. In the second place, the subject did not understand the confederate as a trainer, per se, but simply as another subject who had greater training in making these kinds of judgments, nor did they understand their task as discerning the confederate’s criteria, but simply to come up with “a reasonable, consistent, and justifiable criterion of psychopathology.” Third, the subjects in the “suspicious” condition were punished with electric shock for either not showing their choice or for “incorrect” answers. So the fact that they began to show their choices more often simply reduced the likelihood of receiving the electric shock. And fourth, the subjects in the “trusting” condition were less able to discern the “trainer’s” criteria because they were given inconsistent feedback; thus the greater “learning” of those in the suspicious condition was a result of consistency of feedback, not whether the trainer was trusting or suspicious. These authors stated that they “would not like to see totally disregarded the possible role of suspicion in introducing stability into the trainee’s world” (Kelley & Ring, 1961, p. 300), but certainly their methods and results ought to be regarded with a great deal of suspicion.

Trust seems to be a reciprocal relationship between superiors and subordinates. In a study of professionals and their secretaries, where a variety of personality and power variables were assessed, the superiors’ trust in the secretary was the only factor that predicted the secretary’s trust in the superior and vice-versa (Butler, 1983). Trust also seems to play a role in employee reactions to supervision. In a study of the perceptions of fairness of performance evaluations by supervisors, the level of trust in the supervisor was more important to perceived fairness than any other characteristics of the performance evaluation
process (Fulk, Brief, & Barr, 1985). In addition, the results of a study by Rosen and Jerdee (1977) suggested that superiors felt less trust for subordinates who were lower in job status or predominately from a minority group and were consequently less willingness to use participative approaches to decision making with these groups. Differences in power in hierarchical relationships apparently play a very real role in the development of trust in relationships.

When relationships are embedded in an organizational context the dimensions and dynamics of trust make a very real impact on the effectiveness of the organization. The relationship of trust to four organizational processes are explored in this study -- collaboration, communication, organizational citizenship, and the proliferation of rules. Collaboration is explored in depth in the next chapter. Trust and its relationship to communication, organizational citizenship, and the proliferation of rules are explored below. Research on trust in the context of schools is then explored.

Trust and Social Processes in Schools

Although research on trust in schools is relatively recent, interest in dynamics of trust in organizations has been underway for a longer time. Research on trust in organizations can be brought to bear on the relationships of trust in schools. Testing whether the relationships found in the business world hold in schools provides a rich field for future research. Research on trust in hierarchical relationships, and organizational processes such as communication, organizational citizenship, and the proliferation of rules are all subjects addressed in the literature on organizational trust.
Trust and Communication

Trust is necessary for open communication in an organization. People with a high degree of trust are more likely to disclose more accurate, relevant, and complete data about problems, as well as their thoughts, feelings or ideas (Wrightsman, 1974; Zand, 1971). Distrust, on the other hand, is likely to have a deleterious effect on communication. When interacting with a distrusted person, especially if that person holds more power within an organizational hierarchy, the goal of communication becomes the protection of one’s interest and the reduction of one’s anxiety rather than the accurate transmission of ideas (Bartolme, 1989; Mellinger, 1956). A person may feel compelled to be evasive or to distort attitudes or information in communicating with a distrusted person.

Very different patterns of communication result from differential levels of trust between participants at differing levels in an organization. When there was a high level of trust between superiors and subordinates, Roberts and O’Reilly (1974) found that subordinates expressed high levels of confidence in the accuracy of information coming from the superior, a desire for interaction with the superior, and satisfaction with communication with the superior. When there was low trust, subordinates disclosed a great tendency to withhold information and acknowledged significant forces to distort upward communication. The quality of communication has been linked to the effectiveness of the organization (O’Reilly & Roberts, 1977).

Empirical evidence supports the claim that trust is affected by the amount and quality of communication in a relationship. Using a PD game, Loomis (1959) anticipated that the percentage of participants who perceived trust would increase with increments in the degree
of communication permitted by the experimental design. Further, he predicted that participants would act in trustworthy ways if they perceived trust, and act defensively if they did not perceive trust. As predicted, the percentage of perceived trust increased as communication increased as did trustworthy behavior. When Schlenker, Helm and Tedeschi (1973) varied the accuracy of information in a PD game, participants tended to make choices either to cooperate or to compete based on their perception of the trust relationship. When participants received promises that were only 50% accurate, they cooperated less and were more likely to be evasive or dishonest in their own communications.

When high trust allows for the open exchange of information, problems can be disclosed, diagnosed, and corrected before they are compounded. Principals can help foster the flow of information to them by being open with communication that flows from them (Bartolme, 1989, p. 135). Principals who want to encourage candor among their staffs must cultivate an atmosphere of trust.

**Trust and Organizational Citizenship**

Organizational citizenship describes instances when a worker spontaneously goes beyond the formally prescribed job requirements and performs non-mandatory behaviors without expectation of receiving explicit recognition or compensation (Deluga, 1994, p. 316). Organ (1988) emphasized the importance of organizational citizenship in promoting organizational effectiveness. “Organizational citizenship behaviors are vital for productivity because organizations cannot forecast through stated job descriptions the entire spectrum of subordinate behaviors needed for achieving goals” (p. 4). These kinds of behaviors are
particularly important for schools, where formal job descriptions can, at best, delineate broad parameters of the expectations of teachers’ responsibilities.

Organizational citizenship behaviors include altruism, courtesy, conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue. Altruism refers to voluntary behaviors that assist a specific individual with a given problem whereas courtesy includes behaviors directed at the prevention of future problems. Conscientiousness is characterized by behaviors that go beyond minimal job requirements, while sportsmanship describes employees who amiably tolerate annoyances that are an inevitable part of any employment setting. Civic virtue has to do with involvement in the political life of the organization. When these behaviors are absent organizational life is likely to be strained and fraught with tension.

Transformational leadership behaviors describe a leader who has articulated a clear vision, is able to foster an acceptance of group goals, and holds high performance expectations, while providing an appropriate model for followers to emulate, individualized support, and intellectual stimulation. A study of these behaviors found that they led to greater citizenship behavior of subordinates only if the employees trusted the leader. When employees did not trust the leader these behaviors did not lead to greater citizenship (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990). Leadership behaviors without trust lead nowhere. The implications for schools are significant. It seems that in order for principals or superintendents to be effective in producing a kind of organizational culture in which employees are inspired to go beyond the explicit requirements of their job requires earning the trust of organizational participants.
Trust and the Proliferation of Rules

Organizations must continually balance extending trust to employees at various levels of the organization with the creation of safeguards against the possibility of opportunistic behavior. Organizations adopt rules and formal organizational mechanisms to act as substitutes for interpersonal trust and to restore damaged trust within the organization (Shapiro, 1987; Zucker, 1986). However, formal controls instituted to enhance trust by increasing performance reliability can undermine trust and interfere with the achievement of the very goals they were put in place to serve. Rules and contracts are likely to have negative consequences and to be counterproductive because of what they communicate to those to whom they are directed.

The extreme elaboration of bureaucratic rules is prompted by an abiding distrust of people and of their intentions...Rules are a form of communication to those who are seen as desirous of evading responsibilities, of avoiding commitment, and of withholding proper and full performance of obligations. (Fox, 1974, quoting Gouldner, 1955, pp. 163, 179)

The consequence of such a stance impact organizational participants’ affiliation with the organization. Both teachers as well as students may respond to a proliferation of rules with feelings of alienation, disloyalty, and lack of commitment, which ironically can make dishonesty and cheating more prevalent (Govier, 1992).

Sitkin and Stickel (1996) witnessed the conflict and emergence of distrust that resulted when a system of bureaucratic rules was introduced into a professional organization. The use of standardized procedures was seen as threatening to the workers’ sense of professionalism, and resulted in hurt feelings and a sense of not being appreciated. When
employees perceived a mismatch between the tasks they performed and the management control systems they had to accommodate, distrust was the result (Sitkin & Stickel, 1996).

Rules and regulations are likely to be effective only when the requirements of a task are understood well enough to be specified clearly and concisely, but they may engender distrust and resentment in situations where workers need a certain amount of discretion in order to function effectively (Fox, 1974). The work of schools is complex and changes with the needs of each student. Discretion is required and resentment and distrust are likely to result when teachers perceive a proliferation of rules interfering with their ability to do their jobs well.

**Trust in Schools**

Trust has been called the “foundation of school effectiveness” (Cunningham & Gresso, 1993) and yet studies of trust in schools are scarce. Filling this gap, Hoy and his colleagues (1985, 1988, 1989, 1992, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998) have engaged in over a decade of research on the dynamics of trust in schools. Defining trust as “a work group’s generalized expectancy that the words, actions and promises of another individual, group or organization can be relied upon... and that the trusted person will act in one’s best interest (p. 2),” Hoy and Kupersmith (1985) developed an instrument to measure faculty trust in schools. Two subscales of that measure, faculty trust in colleagues and faculty trust in the principal, have been found to be important aspects of the trust in a school setting.

Teachers’ trust in their colleagues as well as their principal has been linked to school effectiveness of elementary (Hoy, Tarter & Witkoskie, 1992) and middle schools (Tarter, Sabo, & Hoy, 1995), and trust in colleagues has been found to have a direct impact on
student achievement in elementary schools (Hoy, Tarter, & Witkoskie, 1992). The authenticity of the principal’s behavior (as measured on the Leader Authenticity Scale, Henderson & Hoy, 1983) was related to faculty trust in the principal (Hoy & Kupersmith, 1985), while authenticity of teacher behavior has been linked to trust in colleagues (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998).

**School climate.** The climate of the school can be one that cultivates trust or that makes trust difficult to foster. Openness in the climate of a school and trust in interpersonal relationships complement each other (Tarter, Bliss, & Hoy, 1989). Empirical evidence links openness of the climate and faculty trust (Hoffman, Sabo, Bliss, & Hoy, 1994) both in the secondary school (Tarter, Bliss & Hoy, 1989) and in the middle school (Tarter, Sabo, & Hoy, 1995). As the culture of the school becomes more cohesive and more open, trust is reinforced (Hoy, Hoffman, Sabo, & Bliss, 1996). In addition, healthy interpersonal relationships have been related to the levels of faculty trust in the principal and in colleagues (Hoy, Sabo, & Barnes, 1996).

Studies of school climate and trust have demonstrated that the behavior of the principal and the behavior of teachers have differential impacts on the quality of trusting relationships in schools. Similar results have been found at the elementary, middle school, and secondary schools in the dynamics of trust and climate. Supportive leadership on the part of the principal influenced the degree of trust teachers felt for the principal but did not engender trust among the faculty in one another. At the same time, teacher behavior helped to create trust in colleagues, but did not make a significant contribution to trust in the principal (Hoy, Tarter, & Witkoskie, 1992; Tarter, Bliss, & Hoy, 1989; Tarter, Sabo, & Hoy,
1995). Both collegial (Hoy, Tarter, & Witkoskie, 1992; Tarter, Sabo, & Hoy, 1995) and engaged behavior (Tarter, Bliss, & Hoy, 1989) on the part of teachers were related to trust in fellow teachers.

These studies indicate the significant role that trust plays in school effectiveness, student achievement, and school climate. They invite further investigation into the mechanisms by which trust makes such a significant impact. Trust is a particular challenge in urban schools. In a study comparing large versus small and suburban versus urban school districts the lower effectiveness of urban schools was attributed to lower levels of trust in urban schools, regardless of the size of the district (Carnoy & Hannaway, 1996). Diversity and transience are two factors that may make trust in urban schools more difficult to build and more difficult to sustain.

**Diversity.** People have a tendency to extend trust more readily to people they perceive as similar to themselves. Trust is more difficult in situations of diversity because people are uncertain about the cultural norms of others (Kipnis, 1996). People’s knowledge of one another’s culture may be limited, based on stereotypes or partial and misleading images from the media. This can leave people uncertain about what to expect. Where people’s culture and language differ they have a harder time perceiving in themselves as members of the same community with a stake in mutual reliance. In order to simplify a complexity of relationships, people tend to divide others into two groups: those with whom they share group membership, and those who are outside that group. In schools there may be various criteria by which people categorize others into in-group or out-groups. Cliques may form on the basis of grade-level, subject taught, instructional philosophies, tenure,
experience, ties with the principal, race, gender, proximity, time of lunch break, or any number of other factors.

Once people have categorized other people, biases begin to develop about members of the in-group and of the out-group. They make assumptions based on group membership about that others’ values, preferences, behavior, and trustworthiness. People are more likely to regard out-group members with suspicion and to stereotype them more readily and negatively than in-group members. People are more likely to see member of the out-group as more homogenous and less varied than members of their own group (Mullen & Hu, 1989). Biased attributions about the capabilities, intentions, and actions of out-group members can fuel feelings of distrust. People tend to attribute the motivations for the behavior of out-group members to underlying attitudes or values while for in-group members they are more likely to consider situational factors that might have influenced behavior (Allison & Messick, 1985). Furthermore, people are more likely to seek information that conforms to their attitudes about their own and other groups, and to discount information that disconfirms it (Klayman & Ha, 1997).

Group biases can be destructive not only by causing people to regard out-group members with suspicion, they can also lead to too much trust for in-group members. People develop a “leniency-bias” (Brewer, 1995) for members of the in-group, and tend to give other in-group members the benefit of the doubt when confronted with information that might otherwise be viewed as diagnostic of a lack of trustworthiness. An overconfidence in the collective can lead individuals to “defer too readily to other members, and may inhibit expressions of doubt or engage in inappropriately severe self-censorship rather than press
their claims as vigorously as they might” (Kramer, Brewer, & Hanna, 1996, p. 381). Janis (1982) called this tendency “groupthink” and exposed it as a factor in some disastrously poor decisions.

Urban schools face tremendous diversity. Languages, ethnic group, race, socioeconomic status all are factors in the diversity of urban schools. This diversity brings a richness, but it also brings with it challenges in the development of trust. People who perceive themselves as different need time, structure, and support to come to view themselves as part of the same collective.

Transience. Because trust takes time to develop it is more difficult in a mobile society. Transience of students and parents, principals and superintendents makes the formation of trust hard to foster in urban schools. The development of trust requires a commitment period in which each party signals both a willingness to be vulnerable to the other party and an unwillingness to exploit the other given the chance (Swinth, 1967). Trust also requires knowledge and experience with a person over a period of time. When some urban schools have a student turn-over rate of over 100% annually, trust can be very difficult to cultivate. People who expect to continue to relate to someone over time have an incentive to maintain trust and reap the benefits of a trusting relationship (Tyler & Kramer, 1996). When they expect to come and go quickly there may be less inducement to avoid opportunistic behavior. Although the obstacles to trust are great, attention to issues of trust may help urban schools to begin to be more effective.
Conclusion and Implications

Trust is a critical factor as we consider school improvement and effectiveness. At all levels of the organization, trust facilitates productivity, and its absence impedes progress. Without trust, students' energy is diverted toward self-protection and away from learning. A proliferation of rules stemming from a lack of trust causes resentment and alienation among teachers and students alike. Without trust, communication becomes constrained and distorted, making problems more difficult to resolve. Even where leaders work to build a common vision and foster acceptance of group goals, absent trust these leaders do not inspire workers to go beyond the minimum requirements of their jobs. When distrust pervades a school culture it is unlikely the school will be effective.

Schools face many obstacles to building trust. Society has new, higher expectations for schools that lead to distrust. New methods of management, and new methods of instruction demand greater trust than was once required. All schools have to cope with greater diversity and transience in our society, but for urban schools these produce enormous challenges for the building of trust. Distrust, once established, has a tendency to be self-perpetuating. The propensity for news of broken trust to spread faster and farther than news of intact trust or trust restored can contribute to this spiral of distrust. However, evidence of the importance of trust to organizational productivity, and to such important outcomes as student achievement compels us to meet the challenge of trust with greater knowledge and understanding.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Predictability</th>
<th>Benevolence</th>
<th>Reliability</th>
<th>Competence</th>
<th>Honesty</th>
<th>Openness</th>
<th>Willing to Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust is an expectation by an individual in the occurrence of an event such that that expectation lead to behavior which the individual perceived would have greater negative consequences if the expectation was not confirmed than positive consequences if it was confirmed (Deutsch, 1958, p. 266).</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal trust is an expectancy held by an individual or a group that the word, promise, verbal or written statement of another individual or group can be relied upon (Rotter, 1967, p.651).</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust consists of actions that increase one’s vulnerability to another whose behavior is not under one’s control in a situation in which the penalty (disutility) one suffers if the other abuses that vulnerability is greater than the benefit (utility) one gains if the other does not abuse that vulnerability (Zand, 1971, p.230).</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust is the placing of a person’s outcomes under the partial or complete control of another, with the expectation that the other will respond so as to maximize goal attainment or minimize negative outcomes (Ellison &amp; Firestone, 1974, p.655). Operationally defined as the willingness to disclose highly intimate information about oneself to a prospective interviewer.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust is an expectancy held by an individual that the behavior of another person or a group will be altruistic and personally beneficial (Frost, Stimpson, &amp; Maughan, 1978, p.103).</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The multidimensionality of trust... include[s] (a) integrity, honesty and truthfulness; (b) competence, technical and interpersonal knowledge and skills required to do one’s job; (c) consistency, reliability, predictability, and good judgment in handling situations; (d) loyalty or benevolent motives, willingness to protect and save face for a person; (e) openness or mental accessibility, willingness to share ideas and information freely (Butler &amp; Cantrell, 1984, p. 19).</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust is the reliance on other’s competence and willingness to look after, rather than harm, things one cares about which are entrusted to their care. Trust is accepted vulnerability to another’s possible but not expected ill will toward one (Baier, 1985, pp. 259, 236).</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust is a work group’s generalized expectancy that the words, actions and promises of another individual. group or organization can be relied upon...and that the trusted person will act in one’s best interest (Hoy &amp; Kupersmith, 1985).</td>
<td>i X X X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Definitions of trust.  
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Table 2.1: Definitions of trust (Continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>predictability</th>
<th>benevolence</th>
<th>reliability</th>
<th>competence</th>
<th>honesty</th>
<th>openness</th>
<th>willing to risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust...is a particular level of the subjective probability with which an agent assesses that another agent or group of agents will perform a particular action....When we say we trust someone or that someone is trustworthy, we implicitly mean that the probability that he will perform an action that is beneficial or at least not detrimental to us is high enough for us to consider engaging in some form of cooperation with him (Gambetta, 1988, p. 217).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust is defined as a type of expectation that alleviates the fear that one’s exchange partners will act opportunistically. It is characterized by a cognitive ‘leap’ beyond the expectations that reason and experience alone would warrant: where opportunism might be rationally expected, trust prevails (Bradach &amp; Eccles, 1989, p. 104).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A rational actor will place trust if the ratio of p the probability that the trustee is trustworthy to 1 - p is greater than the ratio of potential loss if the trustee is untrustworthy to potential gain if the trustee is trustworthy (Coleman, 1990, p. 99)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust is the expectation by one person, group, or firm of ethically justifiable behavior—that is, morally correct decisions and actions based upon ethical principles of analysis—on the part of the other person, group, or firm in a joint endeavor or economic exchange (Hosmer, 1995, p. 399)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust is an individual’s belief or a common belief among a group of individuals that another individual or group (a) makes good-faith efforts to behave in accordance with any commitments both explicit or implicit, (b) is honest in whatever negotiations preceded such commitments, and (c) does not take excessive advantage of another even when the opportunity is available (Cummings &amp; Bromily, 1996, p. 4).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust is one party’s willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the belief that the latter party is (a) competent, (b) reliable, (c) open, and (d) concerned (Mishra, 1996, p. 265).</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust : n 1. Assured reliance on a person or thing; a confident dependence on the character, ability, strength, or truth of someone or something. 2. Dependence on something future or contingent; confident anticipation...5. a charge or duty imposed in faith or confidence or as a condition of some relationship. 7. something entrusted to one to be cared for in the interest of another. (Webster’s Third New International Dictionary).</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust vb 6. to grant discretion to confidently (The American Heritage Dictionary).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x = explicit, i = implicit
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Example Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust Survey (Shaw, 1997).</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Trust, Results, Integrity, Concern.</td>
<td>People are given the freedom they need to do their jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promises and commitments are broken all the time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Trust Inventory (Cummings &amp; Bromily, 1996).</td>
<td>12 or 62</td>
<td>Keeps commitments; Negotiates honestly; Avoids taking excessive advantage.</td>
<td>People follow through with their promises and commitments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>In our opinion, ________ is reliable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We think people in ________ succeed by stepping on other people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We feel that ________ tried to get the upper hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We feel that ________ negotiates with us honestly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We feel that ________ will keep its word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We feel that ________ tries to get out of its commitments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>We feel that ________ takes advantage of people who are vulnerable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Trust Survey (De Furia, 1996).</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Influence, Responsibility, Openness.</td>
<td>My immediate supervisor keeps me informed about what is going on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>My supervisor clarifies what we can mutually expect of each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper management encourages workers to take action even when there are no rules to follow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditions of Trust Inventory (Butler, 1992)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Availability, competence, consistency, discreetness, fairness, integrity, loyalty, openness, trust, promises fulfillment, receptivity.</td>
<td>I seldom know what ________ will do next.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>________ shares his/her thoughts with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If ________ promises something to me, he/she will stick to it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>________ really listens to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>________ keeps secrets that I tell him/her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>________ always tells me the trust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>________ treats me fairly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: Measures of trust. (Continued)
Table 2.2: Measures of trust (Continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Example Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust Scales (Hoy &amp; Kupersmith, 1985).</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Trust in principal; Trust in teachers.</td>
<td>The teachers in this school are suspicious of most of the principal’s actions.* The teachers in this school have faith in the integrity of the principal. Teachers in this school typically look out for each other. Teachers in this school believe in each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust Measures (Scott, 1981).</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>immediate supervisor, work unit, top management, consultant.</td>
<td>I feel free to discuss work problems with my immediate supervisor without fear of having it used against me later. I can rely on members of my workgroup to help me if I have difficulty getting the job done. When management must make decisions which seems to be against the best interests of the employee, I believe management’s decisions are justified by other considerations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Trust At Work (Cook &amp; Wall, 1980).</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(i) Reliability (ii) Capability with reference to (a) peers or (b) management</td>
<td>I can trust the people I work with to lend me a hand if I needed it. Most of my workmates can be relied upon to do as they say they will do. I can rely on other worker not to make my job more difficult by careless work. Our management would be quite prepared to gain advantage by deceiving the workers. Management can be trusted to make sensible decisions for the firm’s future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Employer (Gabarro &amp; Añón, 1976).</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>integrity, consistency, benevolence, fairness, openness.</td>
<td>I believe my employer has high integrity. My employer is not always honest and truthful. In general, I believe my employer’s motives and intentions are good. I don’t think my employer treats me fairly. My employer is open and up-front with me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trust in Intimate Relationships**

| Trust in close relationships (Rempel, Holmes, & Zanna, 1985). | 26 | Predictability; Dependability; Faith. | I usually know how my partner is going to act. He/she can be counted on. (P) I can count on my partner to be concerned about my welfare. (D) Though times may change and the future is uncertain. I know my partner will always be ready and willing to offer me strength and support. (F) |
Table 2.2: Measures of trust (Continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Example Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specific Interpersonal Trust Scale</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Emotional trust,</td>
<td>I could confide in ______ and know that he/she would want to listen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Johnson-George &amp; Swap, 1982).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Reliableness,</td>
<td>If I told ______ what things I worry about, he/she would not think my concerns were silly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overall trust (men only)</td>
<td>It ______ promised to do me a favor, he/she would follow through.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I could expect ______ to tell me the truth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The DyadicTrust Scale (Larzelere &amp; Huston, 1980).</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>There are times when my partner cannot be trusted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>My partner is perfectly honest and truthful with me.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I feel that my partner can be counted on to help me.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generalized Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust-Suspicion Scale (Heretick, 1981).</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Trust, Suspicion.</td>
<td>I think most people would lie to get ahead.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>It is safer to trust nobody.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I tend to place a great deal of trust in other people and have seldom been disappointed.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Trust Scale (Rotter, 1967).</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Skepticism about politicians;</td>
<td>The judiciary is a place where we can all get unbiased treatment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal exploitation;</td>
<td>This country has a dark future unless we can attract better people into politics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Societal hypocrisy;</td>
<td>In dealing with strangers one is better off to be cautious until they have provided evidence that they are trustworthy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reliable role performance.</td>
<td>In these competitive times one has to be alert or someone is likely to take advantage of you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Chun &amp; Campbell, 1974)</td>
<td>Even though we have reports in newspapers, radio and televisions, it is hard to get objective accounts of public events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parents usually can be relied upon to keep their promises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Most repairmen will not overcharge even if they think you are ignorant of their specialty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash, Stack, &amp; Luna (1975).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Benevolence, Openness.</td>
<td>The number of seconds a person would wait before falling backwards into the arms of a partner; the willingness to disclose personal information to a stranger.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deutsch (1958).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>making a cooperative move in a mixed-motive game.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = reverse-scored.
CHAPTER 3
COLLABORATION

The move toward greater collaboration in schools, to include teachers in the decision making and governance of schools, is part of a second wave of school reform efforts that have swept this country in the past two decades. The first wave of the movement was sparked by the 1983 publication of *A Nation at Risk* that served as a clarion call to focus attention on the problems of our nation’s schools. These problems included the ways schools had failed to live up to our hopes for them as equalizers of opportunity as well as anxiety about the ability of schools to prepare the next generation to compete in a global economy. The initial reforms served to reinforce the bureaucratic structure of school organizations, and included such measures as teacher competency tests and merit pay (Conley, Schmittle & Shedd, 1988). These reforms were constructed primarily by state-level educators, policymakers, and private citizens without the involvement of teachers. They “implicitly blamed teachers for education’s deficiencies and prescribed remedies to compel and entice those individuals to improve. Teachers, not surprisingly, felt that their role as professional partners in the educational enterprise was slighted” (Conley, Schmittle & Shedd, p. 259).

The second wave of reform, and the call for greater collaboration, grew in response to the criticisms of this first wave of reforms. Greater collaboration has involved many
constituencies, from collaboration between universities and schools; partnerships with the business community to bring both managerial expertise as well as material and human resources to schools; involving parents and community members as stakeholders in the governance and oversight of schools; involving teachers in school-level decision making; and the involvement of students in classroom and school decision making. Although each of these provides fertile ground for research, four levels of collaboration will be examined in the current study. These are teacher involvement in school-level decision making, teacher collaboration with other teachers in class-level decision making, parent involvement in school-level decision making, and student collaboration in the classroom.

Defining Collaboration

The study of collaboration has been hampered by a lack of consensus on the meaning of the term. Dachler (1978) complained that the literature on employee participation in decision making was “diffuse in meaning and purpose, involves frequent contradictions, harbors a plethora of undefined terms, is plagued by ambiguous theoretical underpinnings, and provides few useful statements for the policy makers” (p. 17). These criticisms apply to the literature on collaborative practices in schools as well.

The web of terms related to collaborative practices in schools includes inter-organizational cooperation (e.g. partnerships, coalitions, alliances, networks, consortia, or collaboratives); decentralization of decision making from the district to the school level (e.g. school-based or site-based management); principals inclusion of teachers in decisions that have traditionally been their prerogative (e.g. shared decision making, participatory decision making, teacher empowerment, school improvement teams, or democratic leadership);
teachers working together to enhance their professional knowledge and expertise (e.g. peer observation, peer mentoring, peer coaching, peer assistance and review); parent involvement in governing their local schools (e.g. advisory councils, local school councils, or parent empowerment); and students working together to improve learning for all students (e.g. cooperative learning, peer learning, small group instruction, student empowerment, etc.).

Until recently, the term “collaboration” has most often been applied to inter-organizational partnerships or cooperation. An examination of the meaning of the term in that context may prove useful in defining intra-organizational collaboration, or collaboration within schools. Table 3.1 gives examples of some of the ways inter-organizational collaboration has been defined. As diverse as these definitions are they share a number of dimensions. These dimensions are explored below.

**Autonomous or Independent parties**

The first element or dimension is that of autonomy. Collaboration is assumed to take place between autonomous or independent parties. Autonomy has to do with the issue of choice, whether participants can choose to be involved or not.

Stakeholders retain their independent decision-making powers even when they agree to abide by shared rules within the collaborative alliance. In some cases, stakeholders have complete autonomy, even with regard to the collaboration. In other cases participants may agree to relinquish some autonomy to the collaborative alliance. If participants relinquish all autonomy, a different organizational form is created—a merger, perhaps, but not a collaboration (Wood & Gray, 1991, pp. 146-147).

When applying a term that has traditionally been used in an inter-organizational context for intra-organizational work relationships, the assumption of independence is somewhat blurred. However, because of traditional norms in schools, teachers in many respects are
quite autonomous, and can choose whether or not to work together or to work with the principal. Parents can more readily be considered independent but the extent to which students could be considered autonomous is quite limited. The four kinds of collaboration considered in this study (principal-teacher, teacher-teacher, parent-school, teacher-student) meet this element to various degrees.

**Equal Status**

Several definitions of collaboration make the assumption, either explicitly or implicitly, that the actors have equal power and status within the structure of the collaboration, while others require only that power and status are shared (Schwartz, 1990). The issue of parity in other cases rests with sharing somewhat equally in the outcomes or benefits of the collaboration. The requirement of equality is more of an ideal than a reality, however. Sirotnik and Goodlad (1988) point out that partnerships as a “mutually collaborative arrangement between equal partners working together to meet self-interests while solving common problems” has rarely occurred in practice. Even when partners are given equal power within the formal decision making structure, some members will have greater informal power and greater status. Although applying the term collaboration in an intra-organizational context once again blurs on the requirement of equality because of the unequal status of various organizational roles, the spirit of collaboration requires that, on a structural level at least, all participants have an equal opportunity to voice their opinion and contribute to decisions.
Structured Process

Collaboration is a “change-oriented relationship” (Wood & Gray, 1991) that is well-defined and mutually beneficial (Mattessich & Monsey, 1992) that involves all participating stakeholders and lasts for some duration. A collaboration requires a jointly developed structure in which to make decisions and conduct its business (Mattessich & Monsey). The stakeholders must agree on the rules and norms that will govern their interactions (Wood & Gray). These rules will attempt to assure that all parties have an opportunity to have their voices heard in decisions made by the collaborative. Some require that decisions can only be made by consensus. Consensus does not necessarily imply unanimity, only that a sufficient number of participants are in favor of a decision to carry it out and that the others understand the decision and will not stand in the way of the group moving forward in a particular direction (Schmuck, 1972).

To Act or Decide

Collaboration involves making decisions and taking action. Wood and Gray (1991) emphasize the centrality of action to the process of collaboration. “Collaboration can be said to exist merely if/as long as the stakeholders engage in a process intended to result in action or decision (p. 147).” When individuals or groups come together simply to share information it is not collaboration. Principals who meet with teachers or parents to inform them of the reasons for a decision they have made or even to gain information from teachers or parents to assist in their own decision making, cannot be said to have collaborated.
Commit Resources

In a collaborative process, each of the participants must agree to commit resources to the shared endeavor (Intriligator, 1983; Mattessich & Monsey, 1992). At a minimum, participants must be willing to invest time and energy into the process, two crucial and often scarce resources. Often financial resources are also required to facilitate the workings of the group, for example, money to cover the cost of postage or clerical help, to pay for a trained facilitator or training for the participants in group processes. Projects undertaken to meet the goals of the collaborative may also require a significant investment of resources. Unless all parties are contributing resources of some kind, it would be difficult to consider the shared work a collaboration.

Shared Responsibility and Rewards

Not only does collaboration require a sharing of resources, but it requires a sharing of responsibility and rewards (Hoyt, 1978; Mattessich & Monsey, 1992). When collaboration takes place within an organization, shared responsibility may entail the willingness of individuals or groups with greater authority to share that discretion. When accountability for outcomes rests on certain individuals within formal organizational structures this sharing may be difficult; these individuals may be reluctant to have others share in decisions when accountability is not also shared. In some cases organizational structures, and problems of accountability can seriously inhibit the collaborative practices that are possible. Some authors distinguish between cooperation and collaboration in that cooperation does not require either the commitment of resources to a joint decision process or a joint sharing of rewards (Hord, 1986).
Common Goal

Collaboration involves two or more independent parties who see the value of coming together to reach a common goal (Intriligator, 1983; Mattessich & Monsey, 1992). These goals may be in the context of "gaining power to facilitate some outcome, overcoming obstacles, or simply and basically trying to survive" (Olson, 1990, p. 11). The common goal may be the planning, implementation and evaluation of a common project, or it may be taking action to confront a problem.

Collaboration is a popular concept in education, and yet it has been hard to define and hard to measure. An examination of how collaboration has been defined in inter-organizational studies revealed a number of factors— it takes place between autonomous parties, these parties agree upon decision making structure, and all parties share responsibilities, resources, and rewards in the pursuit of a common goal. Applying each of these elements to intra-organizational collaboration poses as many difficulties as it solves.

If the participants are autonomous then they have to have a choice to participate or not, and can withdraw from the joint project if they choose. The common goal is not hard to decipher in schools, but what are the joint responsibilities, resources, and rewards? A look at the decision participation literature within schools may help clarify some of the issues.

Philosophies of Participative Decision Making in Schools

Collaboration can be considered a specific type or subcategory of shared decisions making. It can be distinguished from shared decision making in that shared decision making may entail a decision maker gathering information from organizational participants while retaining final decision making authority. Different management philosophies posit different
purposes for participative decision making. Differing amounts of trust invested in workers have implications for the level of worker participation thought desirable. Traditional bureaucratic philosophy regards workers with suspicion, assuming they find work inherently distasteful and must be compelled to work. The input of workers in decision making or job specification is not sought. The human relations philosophy has a somewhat more optimistic view of workers, assuming that if they have certain psychological needs met, such as recognition and a sense of belonging, they will be motivated to work. The human resources philosophy, on the other hand, assumes that workers want to contribute to meaningful goals that they have helped to establish (Creed & Miles, 1996). The goal is better decisions. Contrasting views of collaboration from a human relations and a human resources philosophies are reviewed in the following sections.

**Human Relations**

Managers who subscribe to the human relations model believe that when employees feel they have influence over decisions they will be satisfied and will accept and implement decisions more readily. Worker participation is viewed as a transaction cost used to buy employee acceptance of management decisions (Conley, Schmiddle & Shedd, 1988, pp. 260). Managers with this philosophy share information with workers and involve them in routine decisions to satisfy their basic needs to belong and feel important. This involvement is meant to improve morale and reduce resistance to formal authority (Bartunek & Keys, 1979; Creed & Miles, 1996). Employee participation is not expected to increase decision quality because the employees are not considered to possess the knowledge, expertise or competence to contribute to higher quality decisions. Instead, employee participation is “a
symbolic gesture demonstrating the managers' concern for the employees' opinions, even though the opinions may have little substantive impact on actual decisions" (Bartunek & Keys, p. 66).

Research confirms that participation is associated with a number of positive outcomes that can ultimately benefit an employer, including greater employee morale, organizational commitment, and acceptance of decisions (Belasco & Alutto, 1972; Hoy, Newland, & Blazovsky, 1977; Jackson, 1983; Mohrman, Cooke, & Mohrman, 1978). However, participation in and of itself does not necessarily lead to these positive outcomes. When workers perceive that they have no real influence over the final decisions being made or their opinions are asked only over relatively minor or routine decisions, they may resent the time being spent in meetings and feel duped about having a real voice in meaningful organizational decisions.

**Teacher satisfaction, loyalty, and morale.** A number of studies support the contention that teacher participation in organizational decision making influences teachers' responses to their work. Participation in decisions making has been positively linked with job satisfaction (Jackson, 1983; Mohrman, Cooke, & Mohrman, 1978), although organizational trust was a better predictor of satisfaction than was participation itself (Driscoll, 1978). Tight bureaucratic control was related to a sense of powerlessness among teachers (Isherwood & Hoy, 1973), and power deprivation was a significant predictor of teacher stress (Bacharach, Bauer, & Conley, 1986). The level of participation in organizational decisions concerning hiring, promotion, policies, and programs was significantly related to the level of esprit among teachers and to the loyalty teachers felt toward the principal (Hoy, Newland, &
Blazovsky, 1977). A more positive response to work, then, is a possible but not guaranteed response to greater involvement in decision making.

Decision acceptance. One of the significant benefits managers hope to garner through employee participation is greater acceptance of decisions. Although empirical tests of this proposition in schools seem to be lacking, on a theoretical level researchers concur that organization members will have greater psychological ownership and understanding of decisions they help to formulate (Bartunek & Keys, 1979; Owens & Lewis, 1976). Wood (1973), however, warns that the connection between participation and acceptance may be mediated by influence. When employees have participated in a decision but perceive that they had no influence over the outcome, acceptance may not be improved. Researchers have proposed that faculty trust may be related to their "zone of acceptance" and that if faculty members trust a school's administration to make decisions in their favor they may not want to invest the time that participation requires (Bartunek & Keys; Conway, 1984).

Human Resources

Managers who subscribe to a human resources philosophy have a different view of employees' competencies and consequently view the purposes of employee participation differently. These managers view the knowledge and experience possessed by employees as valuable resources and try to create an environment in which the employees' capabilities can be tapped to enhance decision quality and organizational performance (Bartunek & Keys, 1979, p. 66). Participation is perceived as something received from employees rather than something given by managers (Conley, Schmiddle, & Shedd, 1988, pp. 261). The expectation is that expanding subordinate influence, self-direction, and self-control will lead
to improvements in organizational effectiveness and operating efficiency (Creed & Miles, 1996). Higher worker satisfaction may be a by-product of involvement in decision processes but it is not the goal itself. The goal of employee participation is to improve the quality of the decisions.

Influence versus involvement. A primary distinction that can be drawn between the human relations and human resources philosophies surrounds the issue of influence. The human relations philosophy allows for teacher involvement in school-level decisions, but does not look to them to influence the outcomes of significant decisions. The human resources philosophy, on the other hand, looks for teacher influence to improve decisions.

We view influence as the ability to affect decision outcomes on subjects central to the organization or salient to individuals. As such, influence encompasses more than involvement (inclusion) and authority (legitimate right to decide). We assume that influence is contingent on the possession of relevant resources, the skill and will with which resources are deployed and the manner in which contextual features magnify the resources of some and diminish the resources of others. We assume that influence is apparent when the strategic use of resources enables participants to select, modify to otherwise affect decision outcomes on matters of interest and import" (Malen, Ogawa, & Kranz, 1990, p. 304).

Teachers may be reluctant to be involved in decisions and resentful of the investment time asked of them when they perceive that their actual influence is limited (Bartunek & Keys, 1979; Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1988; Duke, Showers, & Imber, 1980).

Researchers have speculated that the general lack of effectiveness of participation reported in the literature has resulted from the fact that teachers did not feel that participation was legitimate and they were not participating in decisions that were relevant and important to them (Bartunek & Keys, 1979, p. 55).
Teacher respondents in a national survey indicated that previous participation afforded them little real influence and hence increased their skepticism. Nonetheless, they thought that they should be more involved in school and district decision making, especially with respect to issues directly affecting their immediate teaching responsibilities (Bacharach, Bauer & Shedd, 1988, p. 241-256).

Apparently human relations is the more prevalent philosophy in schools.

**Teachers as decision makers.** Teachers are decision makers who for the most part are independently responsible for planning, implementing, and evaluating instructional, counseling, and supervisory efforts within their classrooms. Their work is conducted under conditions of unpredictability and uncertainty with little direction, feedback, or assistance from other adults (Conley, Schmittle & Shedd, 1988, p. 263). Beyond their own classrooms, though, few teachers play any formal role in either formulating or evaluating school policies and plans. However, as Conley, Schmittle and Shedd point out, teachers may have a great deal of informal influence on school policy.

Teachers often determine which strategic board and administrator decisions will actually be implemented; they also frequently make strategic decisions concerning their own goals, objectives, and priorities with little outside direction or scrutiny. Teachers are in a position to do so precisely because they are the only ones with direct and sustained contact with their system’s primary clients (the students) and because those clients’ needs are difficult to anticipate, vary widely, and are constantly changing. (Conley, Schmittle & Shedd, 1988, pp. 262-263)

Given the nature of teachers’ work, Conley, Schmittle and Shedd suggest it is misleading to frame the issue of teacher participation as a question of whether teachers should be involved in school management. Teachers are already managers who manage the school’s primary workers—the students. According to these researchers, the issue of participation is properly framed as one of closer integration of management decision making at the district, school and classroom levels.
Decision domains. Various researchers have delineated the universe of decisions made in schools in various ways. Conley, Schmiddle, and Shedd (1988) describe four managerial processes that schools engage in: direction, organization, support, and monitoring. Each of these processes is carried out at all three levels of the school system: district, school and classroom. These researchers explain that these process must be integrated across levels and processes,

The direction, organization, support or monitoring decisions made at the district level must be translated into other management decisions at the school and classroom levels. At the same time, a management decision in one area (say, direction) invariably requires other decisions in other areas (e.g., organization, support, and monitoring). (Conley, Schmiddle, & Shedd, 1988, p. 267)

Conley, Schmiddle, and Shedd (1988) observed that many of the responsibilities that typically fall to district and school administrators involve the coordinating the activities of teachers in adjacent classrooms and the movement of students, information, and resources from one place to another. They recommended a number of managerial functions that could benefit from teacher participation, including:

- translating general policies into group and individual assignments;
- coordinating different activities;
- setting and adjusting time schedules;
- reconciling conflicting priorities;
- developing human resources;
- securing material and other resources;
- and monitoring the progress of programs, staff members, and students.
In an alternative conceptualization, Mohrman, Cooke, and Mohrman (1978) described the decisions made in schools as falling into three main categories: managerial, technical and negotiations. The managerial realm included decisions about hiring, budgets, assignments of faculty, buildings, and community. Technical decisions were those that centered on teaching and learning, and included decisions about texts, learning, methods, discipline, and instructional policy. The negotiations domain concerned grievances and salaries. While teachers may be included in technical decisions and be represented in the negotiations realm, it is in the managerial realm that they are most likely to be excluded.

Although many organizational benefits potentially derive from employee participation in decision making, the managerial philosophy of the leader will influence the nature of that involvement. Principals with a human relations philosophy give teachers and parents the opportunity to be involved in school level decisions to buy greater acceptance of decisions and increased satisfaction and loyalty. Although they are involved in a participatory decision making process, teachers and parents may not have a great deal of influence over actual decisions. Final decision making authority remains with the principal. Principals with a human resources philosophy, on the other hand, value the insights of teachers and parents and include them in decision making processes in order to receive their knowledge and perspectives in the interest of making better decisions.

It appears that the human relations philosophy that sees value in participative decision making in order to gain employee satisfaction and decision acceptance is the more prevalent in school. Calls for greater collaboration seem to be cajoling principals to move toward a human resources philosophy in which decision making authority is shared in the interest of
better quality decisions. In this study collaboration is defined as organizational participants having not only involvement in organizational decisions but influence over their outcome as well. Is collaboration better? Are group decisions likely to be better than those of individuals? The next section explores that issue.

**Possibilities and Pitfalls of Collaboration**

Collaboration is not easy. It involves people or organizations sharing authority and investing resources for a project over which they do not exercise complete control. It is most likely to be successful when attention has been given to issues of purpose and structure, and when there are favorable environmental conditions. The success of a collaboration in large measure depends on the quality of the interpersonal relationships that develop. Impediments to collaboration must be overcome. Even when favorable factors are present, collaboration is likely to be a messy process, and yet the potential benefits outweigh the difficulties.

**Lessons From Inter-Organizational Collaboration**

Research on inter-organizational collaboration between universities and school districts has identified a number of factors associated with successful collaboration. Although the current research project concerns primarily intra-organizational collaboration, that is relationships within a school, the dynamics of inter-organizational collaboration are instructive.

For a collaborative effort to be successful it was important for there to be a shared vision or mission (Mattessich & Monsey, 1992; Mc Gowan, 1990). In inter-organizational collaboration success was more likely if the purpose was unique and was not currently being met by any other agency or individual (Mattessich & Monsey). It was important for the
collaborative to have concrete, attainable goals, or what McGowan called “a sense of reality.” The group’s work together was facilitated by the development of clear roles and policy guidelines that nonetheless allowed for flexibility and adaptability (Mattessich & Monsey). Communication was vital to collaboration. Open and frequent communication was facilitated by the establishment of informal and formal communication links (Mattessich & Monsey).

One of the most frequently reported obstacles to inter-organizational collaboration was the lack of adequate resources. Critical resources included sufficient funds for training, perks or payoffs for involvement (McGowan, 1990), and a skilled facilitator (Mattessich & Monsey, 1992). Time was a particularly valuable resource. Not only was it necessary to have sufficient time for the group to conduct its business, participants needed to be willing to commit to involvement in the long-term and to persist long enough to produce meaningful results (McGowan). Contextual factors also influenced the success of a collaborative partnership. A collaboration was more likely to be successful when the political and social climate in a community was favorable and when there was a history of successful collaboration or cooperation (Mattessich & Monsey).

Even more important than structural and contextual factors were factors related to interpersonal dynamics. Although institutions such as universities and school districts collaborate, it is people who act on their behalf (Hord, 1986). Without positive interpersonal relationships a collaboration was unlikely to be productive. Collaborative relationships must be characterized by mutual respect, understanding, and trust. In such an environment cooperation, camaraderie, collegiality, and dialogue can flourish (McGowan, 1990).
Collaboration was facilitated when members were flexible, had the ability to compromise, and saw collaboration as in their self-interest. When participants valued each other, communicated openly, and shared responsibility, they were able to generate changes that impacted the institutions they served (McGowan).

Inter-organizational collaboration was fraught with difficulties as participants shared decision making for governance, planning, delivery, and evaluation of joint projects. McGowan (1990) warned, “Ambiguity, uncertainty, and large doses of confusion often accompany partnerships” (p. 42). Structural difficulties inherent in crossing organizational boundaries often caused problems. Impediments included the limitations of organizations in transferring resources and power; external institutional decision-making processes and incompatible structures of organizations; lack of skills for cooperative decision making and lack of concepts for organizing parties; and poor matches between what one party had to offer and what the other needed (Hord, 1986).

Despite all of the difficulties, collaboratives can be powerful agents of change. Although collaboration was time-consuming, frustrating, and messy, it offered the possibility of significant organizational growth. Mc Gowan (1990) described this process, “Participants ‘get hooked’ in a partnership; become willing to trust their peers and the process; open themselves, and grow. Eventually, the institution must change to accommodate these significant personal adjustments” (pp. 42-43). By capitalizing on both parties’ strengths, collaboration resulted in economic savings to both, improved communication, and enhanced project outcomes (Hord, 1986).
Decision Quality in Group Decision Making

School administrators are increasingly being encouraged to include teachers and parents in their decision making for key organizational decisions. Leithwood and Steinbach (1995) suggested that better solutions seemed likely to result from collaborative problem-solving due to

a broader range of perspectives from which to interpret the problem; an expanded array of potential solutions from which to choose; a richer, more concrete body of information about the context in which the problem must be solved; the reduced likelihood of individually biased perspectives operating in the solution process. (p. 97)

They suggested that principals or superintendents would use others to compensate for their own limitations by distributing parts of the problem to others in capitalize on each individual’s unique abilities.

But can a group be expected to make better decisions than an individual? Research suggests that groups may but do not necessarily make higher quality decisions than individuals. Collaboration holds out the possibility of better thinking, as participants articulate their thought processes and listen and respond to the thoughts of others. Better decisions are not automatic, however, when a group of people has attempted to solve a problem together rather than an individual solving it alone. Janis (1982) described how group decision making had led to some notoriously poor decisions when group norms developed that inhibited participants from freely sharing their ideas and misgivings about a course of action. Under what conditions do groups make better decisions than individuals and when is an individual better off making a decision alone?
Problems in Group Decision Making

Groups of people making a decision do not necessarily make higher quality decisions than individuals working alone. Research in decision making has accumulated a wealth of evidence demonstrating that individuals develop decision making heuristics, or rules of thumb, that provide energy-saving short cuts but that also can lead to biases or errors. There is growing evidence that groups can commit the same kinds of heuristic biases as individuals and in fact, these biases may be amplified by group processes.

One common mistake or heuristic bias is the conjunction fallacy or representativeness error. As the amount of detail in a proposed scenario increases, its apparent likelihood increases because it seems more plausible, familiar or representative. However, the actual probability decreases with each additional constraint that must be met (Tversky & Kahneman, 1982, 1983). Research has demonstrated that groups of decision makers are even more likely than individuals to commit the conjunction fallacy or the representativeness error (Argote, Seabright, & Dyer, 1986; Tindale, Sheffey, & Filkins, 1990).

Group polarization refers to the tendency of groups to accentuate or compound the biases or leanings that members bring to the group. Group discussion reinforces group opinion and drives it toward the extremes (Myers & Lamm, 1976). Situations that elicit the choice of risky options in individuals tend to lead to even riskier choices by groups, resulting in what has been called the “risky shift” phenomenon. Conversely, where individuals would tend toward caution, groups are likely to be even more cautious. These greater degrees of riskiness or caution may divert the group from the wisest course of action.
Groups also can tend to compound individual biases when it comes to the kinds of attributions they make, helping to perpetuate stereotypes. Like individuals, groups tend to make attribution errors in judgments about other people, ignoring external determinants of behavior and assuming a correspondence between behavior and some underlying attitude (Allison & Messick, 1985). Groups also evidence the “out-group homogeneity bias” in which they perceive their own members as more varied than members of other groups (Mullen & Hu, 1989). These biases occur even when group members have a great deal of contact and familiarity with members of the out-group. And when “group-serving” biases operate group members make dispositional attributions for group successes but situational attributions for group failure similar to the way individuals make self-serving attributions (Taylor & Doria, 1981).

Another potential drawback to group decision making processes is the propensity of people to hold back and not put forth the same level of effort in solving a complex problem or judgment task as they would have had they worked alone (Weldon & Gargano, 1985, 1988). This “cognitive loafing” is especially evident when participants did not think they would be held accountable for results. When responsibility for results was diffused among members of a group, they did not feel as strong a link between their effort and the final outcome (Latane, Williams & Harkins, 1979). Changing the task structure so that individual contributions would be identified and individuals would be held accountable for the outcome eliminated many but not all aspects of cognitive loafing (Weldon & Gargano, 1988). There was also evidence that members of a group were less consistent information processors than
individuals, even when they were held accountable for the judgments they made (Weldon & Gargano, 1988).

The competition for “air time” is another factor that can reduce the effectiveness of groups as compared to individuals. Valuable contributions may be lost when individuals must wait their turn to speak. Brainstorming has been found to be more effective when ideas were generated independently and later combined than when ideas were generated only in a group session (Hill, 1982). Group work can also be less efficient when one or several people dominate the discussion and the contributions of individuals who had useful information or ideas to share is lost.

Groupthink is what Janis (1982) called group dynamics he observed in retrospective analysis of the decision processes that lead to several notorious fiascos in American foreign policy. Under certain conditions Janis noted the tendency of groups to develop norms that served to cause members to suppress dissent or misgivings about a proposed course of action and to discount or ignore important information or warnings. These groups developed self-appointed “mind guards” who protected the group from information that might have challenged the group’s complacency, and who exerted pressure on any group member who dissented from the majority view. This led to a shared illusion of unanimity, which did not necessarily exist. In addition, these groups shared an illusion of invulnerability that led to overoptimism and excessive risk taking, fueled by stereotyped views of adversaries as too evil to make negotiating worthwhile or too weak and stupid to pose a serious threat. These group members also believed they were serving a noble cause, and convinced themselves they were in the right.
Group leaders who are aware of these dangers can take several steps to avoid the conditions that lead to groupthink (Janis, 1982). First, group leaders should refrain from stating any personal preferences at the outset, and should explicitly encourage dissent and criticism—including criticism of their own positions. Groups can also examine their own decision processes through periodic discussion with others outside the decision-making inner circle. They can invite outside experts or qualified colleagues to attend group meetings and encouraging them to challenge the group's consensus or appoint someone in the group to serve as the devil's advocate. Another strategy is to set up other groups with other leaders to consider the same question. These strategies may take more time or effort but especially when the consequences of poor decisions are high they may help groups arrive at better decisions.

In addition to these problems and biases in group decision making, Mansbridge (1973) identified three more problems in participatory decision making: time, emotion, and inequality. The first problem acknowledges the fact that group decision making usually takes more time than an individual deciding alone. When there are significant time pressures this can lead to difficulties in making a timely response or can lead to lost opportunities. In addition, in an organization where participants are paid for their time meetings can be costly. Organizations have to be concerned with whether the quality of the decisions produced and the greater pay offs in terms of compliance or commitment are worth the additional time being spent. A second consideration in participatory decision making is the emotion it generates. People become identified with their ideas or positions and can become hurt or angry when their ideas are opposed. People's feelings about one another can also enter into
their judgments about possible solutions or courses of action. A third dynamic raised by Mansbridge is the problem of inequality, a recognition that participants will have varying levels of both formal and informal power within a group. A person with low status may be ignored even when their ideas would contribute to a better solution. And high status members may have undue influence, whether their suggestions have merit or not.

These drawbacks and potential pitfalls need to be considered when groups attempt to solve problems and make decisions in a collaborative manner. However, the potential for better solutions and decisions seems compelling enough to risk of these problems and to look for ways to minimize their negative effects.

**When Group Decisions are Superior to Individuals**

The news is not all bad when it comes to people working together on judgment and decision tasks; groups quite often outperform individuals. Groups who have interacted with one another are sometimes compared to individuals working alone, to a mathematically derived “group” score that consists of the average of the individual scores, and the score of the highest performing individual. When these kinds of comparisons are made groups usually perform better than individuals working alone, and to the average “group” score for a non-interacting group. Groups do not always score better than the score of the best performing member. When the group score is inferior to the best performing individual the difference is called “process loss.” When group scores are superior to the best individual score of the group this is called “process gain.” Whether there is process loss or process gain seems to depend partly on the nature of the task and partly on the quality of the interactions in the group.
Whether group discussion will lead to superior judgments or decisions has to do with the type of task and what it requires of participants. As noted in the previous section, where individuals bring systematic biases, the group process can serve to reinforce and exacerbate those biases. But where debate or controversy causes participants to have to articulate and justify the reasons for their choices, superior outcomes may result. For quantitative judgments groups are generally more accurate than individuals. And for brain teasers, logic problems, and general knowledge questions groups usually outperformed individuals, but the best member of a group, working alone, tended to do as well or better than the group as a whole (Hastie, 1986). Blau and Scott (1962) suggested that in organizations when the task was finding the best solution to a problem the performance of groups was frequently superior to that of individuals, but for a task involving coordination participatory problem solving would be inferior to an individual working alone.

Controversy can be fruitful in group processes. The optimal level of conflict seems to be a curvilinear function, too little or too much is not productive (Bearison, Magzaman, & Filardo, 1986; Tudge, 1986). Experienced group members may come to view disagreements as potential sources of information rather than as threats.

To explore the importance of controversy in group decision making, participants in an experiment were asked to make judgments of the number of deaths each year in the United States from various causes -- first as individuals, and then as members of a three person group (Snieszek & Henry, 1989). Group judgments were significantly more accurate than the average individual judgments (the non-interacting group score), leading to a 23.7% reduction in standardized bias. Beyond that, 30% of the group judgments were more accurate
than the group’s most accurate individual judgment. Two factors related to the high level of process gain. First, when there were large discrepancies in the initial judgments individuals brought to the group, final judgments tended to be more accurate. And second, when groups, after deliberation, made group judgments outside the range of initial individual judgments these estimates tended to be more accurate than the individual judgments.

The ability to make use of feedback can be a factor leading to increased accuracy in group judgments. When participants in an experiment were asked to make promotion decisions after reviewing the employment records of fictitious employees and those judgments were compared to those of a professional assessment center, groups were able to improve their performance when given feedback after each judgment, while individuals performed best when they were given feedback only about those employees they decided to promote (Tindale, 1989). This difference may have been due to an information overload on the part of individuals, while groups were better able to cope with and make use of abundant feedback.

The size of a group can also be a factor in its effectiveness. With an easy task a larger group increased the chances that the group would contain at least one member who could solve the problem. When the task was more difficult or complex group members were more likely to pool their resources and correct each other’s errors. In this case, more group members meant more intellectual resources but it also made for a more challenging task of coordinating efforts (Hill, 1982).

Another factor that can influence the accuracy of group judgments is the quality of group interaction. This quality can be influenced by the presence and behavior of a leader.
In one experiment, groups attempting to solve a multi-step problem were assigned to one of two conditions-- one in which the leader had been instructed to passively observe the group in its deliberations, and a second in which the leader was instructed to actively encourage all participants to express their opinions. Although groups outperformed individuals regardless of whether groups leaders were passive or active, accuracy was highest when groups leaders coaxed all group members to share their point of view (Maier & Solem, 1952). This once again demonstrated that open discussion and debate can lead to significant increases in the accuracy of group decision processes. One of the tasks a group must accomplish to effectively solve a problem is to exchange and share information about the problem. The greater the amount of relevant information the group members share, the better the problem solution is likely to be (Kelley & Thibaut, 1969).

Growth of Individuals and the Collective

Collaborative problem solving can enhance the cognitive processes of organizational participants as they act on behalf of the school. Collaboration has the potential for increased cognitive growth of participants as they articulate their thought processes and listen and respond to the thoughts of others. This growth, however, is not automatic. Leithwood and Steinbach (1995) proposed that the growth of participants in collaborative problem solving was more likely when

- the process used by the group is actually superior to the individual’s independent problem solving and the individual participants recognize the superiority;
- when there are opportunities for the group to reflect consciously on the process in which they are involved, to evaluate it, and participate in its refinement;
• and when individual members of the group compare their own independent problem
  solving with the group’s processes and identify ways of increasing the robustness of
  their own independent processes. (p. 98)

Individuals are able to learn to be better problem solvers themselves when they participate
in group problem solving processes that model for them higher quality decision making
strategies. This learning is enhanced when the group and the individuals in it reflect on the
processes at work.

Collaboration holds out the possibility of better thinking on the part of participants
and better decisions for schools. But group decision processes may also be inferior to an
individual deciding alone. Those who would structure collaborative decision processes
would do well to be aware of the potential biases and pitfalls that can develop in a group
process. Cultivating a productive level of controversy is one means leaders can employ to
counteract the negative effects of these biases. Leaders must also be aware that participative
processes can be costly in terms of time which is a valuable resource in organizations. The
emotion that is generated by collaborative processes can benefit the organization through
increased enthusiasm, satisfaction, and ownership on the part of participants, but it can also
leave people with hurt feelings and interfere with the quality of decisions when conflict is
not managed productively. When carefully structured, collaborative problem solving can be
a valuable means to enhance the quality of organizational decisions.

Collaboration and School Relationships

Collaboration takes many forms in schools. It can function within and between
organizational levels. Four aspects of collaboration in schools will be explored in this study:
collaboration between the principal and teachers on school-level decisions, faculty collaboration with colleagues on classroom-level decisions, principals and teachers collaborating with parents on school-level decisions, and teachers collaborating with students on class-level decisions and constructing collaborative learning experiences for students.

**Collaboration Between Principal and Teachers**

Collaborative decision making is a process with potential benefits of higher quality decisions and greater ownership and implementation of decisions, but it also can be costly in terms of time and energy with no guarantee that potential benefits will be realized. Principals are more likely to reap the benefits of participation when the process is carefully structured to include teachers in decisions that matter to them, and when their knowledge and expertise leads to real changes in the outcome. When an administrator only pretends to be interested in their input, teachers are likely to become disillusioned with involvement.

**Who to involve in decisions?** Clearly it would be unmanageable and counter-productive to try include every teacher in every decision faced by a school. Hoy and Tarter (1992, 1993, 1995) have developed a model to guide administrators in issues of who to include in decision making. It is based on the proposition that there are some decisions that subordinates will accept without question because they are indifferent to them (Barnard, 1938). These decisions are said to be in their zone of acceptance (Simon, 1947). Subordinates do not need to be involved in decisions of this kind, and in fact, may resent giving up time for participation they perceive as unnecessary or meaningless. Other decisions however, subordinates want to be involved with because they have a personal stake in the outcome of the decision and they have expertise to contribute to the solution (Hoy & Miskel, 1996).
In a school setting, when decisions fall outside teachers’ zone of acceptance, involving teachers in decision making will increase the likelihood that the decision will be accepted. If teachers have a stake in a decision but no real expertise to add, then the principal may include them, but structure the process as an apprenticeship so that teachers can see the appropriate expertise modeled and begin to construct a conceptual map of the factors involved. If a teacher has expertise but no stake in a particular decision, he or she can be asked to share that expertise as a consultant but full involvement in the final decision is not necessary (Hoy & Tarter, 1995).

According to this model, when teachers have both a stake and expertise in a decision domain they should have extensive involvement in decision making. Whether teachers should share in full decision making authority, however, depends on whether or not the principal trusts that they are committed to organizational goals. If organizational goals are not shared throughout the faculty then a principal will want to involve teachers but maintain final decision making authority lest decisions be coopted by self-interest. Constructing a shared problem-solving process may give the teachers the opportunity to be guided through a process in which organizational goals are made explicit. When possible solutions are evaluated in light of overarching goals and key values it may result in a greater sharing of those values and goals. If teachers can be trusted in their commitment to organizational goals, then Hoy and Tarter (1995) suggest a situation of full collaboration exists and principals should share their authority with other participants.

**Collaborative problem solving as cognitive apprenticeships.** As principals include teachers in collaborative problem solving and allow teachers to begin to step into leadership
roles, they can share their problem-solving knowledge and create a culture in which a common set of values drives decisions. Teachers often complain, however, that they are unprepared to step into these kinds of administrative roles. Principals can conceive of initial collaborative experiences as cognitive apprenticeships to train teachers in the thinking processes they use in solving problems. Apprenticeships typically involve an expert showing the apprentice how to do a task, watching the apprentice practice portions of the task, and then turning over more and more responsibility until the apprentice is proficient enough to accomplish the task independently. In a cognitive apprenticeship, thinking processes are brought to the surface and made visible so that novices can build a conceptual model of the processes that are required to solve the problem (Collins, Brown, & Holum, 1991).

Principals who involve teachers in school-level decisions may engage in several important elements or stages of cognitive apprenticeships, including modeling, coaching, scaffolding, reflecting, and fading (Collins, Brown, & Holum, 1991). Administrators model their strategic knowledge of problem-solving heuristics as well as control strategies for monitoring how the problem-solving process is going, diagnosing what has gone wrong when things get off track, and searching for a remedy to steer the process back in a more productive direction. Thinking out loud or making explicit the thinking behind the guidance of the process can help apprentices see these strategies at work. Coaching and scaffolding take place as principals allow teachers to take over more leadership of problem-solving processes, offering hints and feedback, directing attention to previously unnoticed aspects of the task, or performing the parts of the task that the apprentice is not yet able to master. Reflection is important in getting novices to articulate their knowledge, reasoning, or
problems-solving processes in order to clarify their thinking and notice where thinking may be unclear or in error. The natural culmination of the cognitive apprenticeship is the fading of supports and independent performance not just in problem-solving but problem-setting as well. As teachers gain the leadership and problem-solving expertise required in complex school-level decisions they can more readily assume collaborative roles in future decisions.

**Teacher Collaboration with Colleagues**

Studies confirm that teachers have few opportunities to engage in substantive dialogue and exchange of information with other teachers, even though as Conley, Schmittle, and Shedd, (1988) point out, “their pedagogical knowledge, skills, and information about students are arguably a school system’s most valuable resource” (p. 266). Rosenholtz (1989) found that teachers felt they continued to learn about their profession throughout their careers in schools where collaboration was the norm. In these schools, principals and faculties shared values about teaching, they set clearly defined goals for teaching improvement, and principals used teacher evaluations as tools to help teachers improve. Where these conditions did not prevail, teachers tended to think they had learned all they needed to know about teaching within the first few years of their careers. These teachers tended to reach their peak performance after about four or five years. After that they tended to become stagnant and their effectiveness with students began to decline, perhaps because of little new input.

**Norms of isolation.** Teaching can be a lonely profession. Researchers who have documented the work life of teachers have noted how isolated teachers are from one another, how few interactions teachers have with other adults in the course of a day, and how brief
those few encounters are (Lortie, 1975; Sarason, 1996). Researchers have decried this isolation as counterproductive to the purposes of school.

One would expect that a profession dedicated to learning would be structured in such a way that its members would learn from one another. In this light, the isolation of teachers from other adults is a glaring anomaly....The isolated conditions under which teachers practice their profession impede professional growth by making it difficult for teachers to exchange ideas among themselves and with administrators. (Smith & Scott, 1990, pp. 9-10)

Novice teachers have difficulty making the transition from college and student teaching to the realities of managing their own classrooms because they are often denied access to the advice, assistance, and support of more experienced colleagues (Conley, Schmmiddle & Shedd, 1988, pp. 266). They are particularly unprepared for the loneliness of the classroom and the lack of relationships in which questions and problems can be asked and discussed without the fear of being evaluated negatively (Sarason, 1982). Rosenholtz (1987) commented that isolation was probably the greatest impediment to learning to teach or to improving existing skills because it forced teachers to rely on trial and error and to fall back on their own memories of schooling for models of teaching.

The isolation of teachers is not necessarily viewed as troublesome to teachers but may be seen as necessary to maintain the autonomy teachers value. Norms in the teaching profession have developed that support this isolation, norms that have to be confronted before teachers will be willing to collaborate. Two strong norms in the teaching profession support teachers’ autonomy. One such norm is the “ideology of noninterference” that regulates interactions among teachers, as well as between teachers and administrators (Ashton, Webb, & Doda, 1983). Teachers define their need for discretion as a right to
autonomy. This norm of noninterference tends to work against creating the kinds of "discourse communities" described by Putnam and Borko (1997) because it works against cultivating the kind of challenge, peer debate, and criticism required. In schools where these autonomy norms exist, requests for peer assistance are characterized as indicators of incompetence (Rosenholtz, 1989). Another norm among teachers is an "egalitarian norm" in which all teachers share equal status. Collaborative practices may violate this norm because requesting or proffering advice confers superior status on the advice giver.

**Changing norms.** Changing the norms of a school toward more collaborative practices entails changing the "theory of action" in use by the school. The knowledge and beliefs of a school are embedded in the theories of action that guide and justify the activity of the school, including strategies for teaching and managing students, the values that govern the choice of strategies and the assumptions that bind strategies and values together. The "espoused theory" is the theory of action that is advanced to explain or justify a given pattern of activity. The "theory-in-use" is the theory of action that is implicit in the performance pattern of activity (Argyris & Schon, 1996). A school's organizational structure, systems of communication, means for allocating resources, formal rules and regulations, as well as the informal norms, and the rewards and sanctions that are used to keep participants in check constitute its theory of action. Accepted teaching practices, curriculum guides, school disciplinary codes, rewards, honors, and ceremonies embody the school's knowledge and beliefs about student learning and behavior.

To fundamentally change the norms of how teachers or teachers and principals interact with one another is to supplant one theory of action for another. This is no small
undertaking. School culture and norms represent the collective wisdom of organizational participants as to how problems should be solved (Schein, 1985). Asking schools and teachers to change their fundamental beliefs presents a formidable challenge, made all the more substantial as schools attempt to change their theories of action while in the midst of conducting their business. Attempting to change these norms or theories of action involves a period of disequilibrium that can leave teachers (as well as administrators) anxious, uncertain, and with increased stress, even if it is also accompanied by renewed excitement and vigor.

**Schools Collaborating with Parents**

The move to include parents in school governance is a boundary-spanning strategy, a way to include an important constituency or group of stakeholders with the hope of gaining many of the same benefits as including teachers. It may be viewed as a way to garner increased parental support and satisfaction (Goldring & Shapira, 1993; Griffith, 1996b). It can also been viewed as an opportunity to improve schools’ responsiveness to their communities.

Although in his review of the literature Conway (1984) could find not consistent evidence that the involvement of parents and community members led to greater student achievement or even greater satisfaction with the schools, he predicted that the move to have parents involved in school-level decision making would continue.

At the present time, it appears that citizen direct participation in educational decision making is likely to continue, but the rationale for it will be based necessarily more on political reasons, such as demonstrated in mandates for participation, as opposed to criteria from empirical inquiry, such as increased satisfaction or maximized decisions as a result of external PDM [participatory decision making]. (p. 23)
Parent advisory councils were mandated as part of many educational reforms, beginning in the 1960s (e.g., Head Start and Chapter 1). Jennings (1979) noted that, after nearly two decades of attempts to involve parents in school decision making through school councils, there was little to show for these efforts other than frustration and failure. Jennings placed blame not only on school administrators' unwillingness to give up power but on teacher's resistance to giving over newly won protections in job security. Another reason for the failure was the organizational problems in the councils themselves, such as high turnover rates and poor attendance at meetings. Recent reform initiatives, especially in urban districts, have reaffirmed a faith in oversight councils for schools, with authority over such issues as budget, staffing, and hiring and firing the principal.

In much the same way that teacher involvement has been distinguished from teacher influence in decision making, parent involvement has been distinguished from parent 'empowerment' or the ability to influence school-level decisions (Griffith, 1996a, 1996b; Goldring & Shapria, 1993; McGrew & Gilman, 1991). Parent empowerment has been related to higher parent satisfaction with schools, however, this effect was mediated by parental income. The opportunity to participate in school-level decision making was more closely related to parental satisfaction for high SES parents than it was for those lower in SES (Goldring & Shapria, 1993). Recent studies have also found evidence of increased student learning where parents exercise some measure of sway in school governance. While both parent involvement and empowerment were related to student achievement on standardized tests, with parental involvement accounting for 25% of the variance and parent empowerment accounting for 5% (Griffith, 1996a) Hoy and his colleagues (1996, 1997) have
also found that parent influence on school policy was positively related to student achievement in studies of the health of school climate.

Many of the same issues surrounding teacher involvement in school-level decision making arise where parents are concerned. Is the involvement in decision making something administrators give to parents in order to "buy" greater support, satisfaction, and acceptance of decisions or do administrators see parents as a potential resource that bring information, insight, and a useful perspective to the table in the search for solutions to problems and opportunities facing the school? The mixed review of the effectiveness of school councils may be the result of differences in how they have be implemented.

**Teachers Constructing Collaborative Experiences for Students**

Does the management philosophy and collaborative practices of the principal translate into teachers' philosophies and practices with their students? Does the quality of relationships among the faculty and the level of trust "trickle down" into classrooms? There is a paucity of research on whether changes in management and organization in schools toward greater collaboration also impacts life in classrooms. Schmuck and Schmuck (1991) observed that when teachers learned new communication skills through an extensive organizational development training that they did put those skills to use in the classroom, constructing experiences for students that mirrored the processes they were learning. They note,

Teachers who practice communication skills [learned through their involvement in an organizational development project] with one another also tend to use similar communication skills with their students in the classroom. Also, teachers who are comfortable cooperating with one another tend to feel comfortable asking their students to cooperate in the classroom. They view the school as a community of
humans engaged in cooperative learning and cooperative development. They believe that power should be shared by all, including the students, and that, whenever possible, decisions should be made by those who will be affected by the decision.

If principals’ management philosophies affect the leadership behavior of teachers in the classroom, creating collaborative structures may be a way for principals to impact classroom practice.

New views of cognition and many reform initiatives encourage greater student participation and cooperation within the classroom. Much of the current practice in schools was founded on a theory of learning that conceived of knowledge as parcels of information that were disseminated by the teacher and that accumulated in students’ minds. This view is often implicit in traditional forms of instruction in which learning is a matter of receiving and practicing information and skills presented by the teacher. On the other hand, much of the reform movement in education seeks to supplant this notion with a more constructivist model of learning where learners are viewed as active problem solvers who construct their own knowledge and the teacher is responsible for providing a learning environment that stimulates students’ cognitive activities (Putnam & Borko, 1997).

There is evidence of a positive impact on students’ attitudes when they are included in classroom decision making. Although he did not find evidence of significantly higher achievement among students in a classroom implementing a participatory model, Conway (1984) did find that students had significantly more positive attitudes. This translated into more positive interactions among students and a higher percentage who remained on task even when the teacher was absent. Richter and Tjosvold (1980) reported similar results, and found that not only did students in the participatory classroom have more positive attitudes
but also a significantly greater positive change in attitudes over the course of the experimental term. Coleman, Collinge, and Tabin (1996) found that the level of collaboration between teachers and students varied considerably between classrooms and seemed to be based on teachers perception of students acceptance of responsibility.

The relationship between collaborative practices and student achievement has been difficult to capture. Marks and Louis reported that the decisions domains over which teachers had influence has an impact on whether or not participation led to real changes in instructional practices. They concluded that the relationships between participation and pedagogical quality and student achievement was mediated by school structure. The results of these few studies, though tentative, suggest the potential for positive student outcomes from greater collaboration.

Conclusion

Group decision making is not the answer to all that ails mortal decision makers. Groups can fall prey to the same kinds of heuristic biases as individuals, and in some cases are even more likely to do so than individuals. In addition, group discussion can tend to polarize judgment, moving it toward more extreme positions of riskiness or conservatism than the members individually might have held. Groups can suffer from cognitive loafing, where members contribute less than their full effort, assuming others will take up the slack. And group processes may be less efficient than individuals when the competition for “air time” limits the participation of members.

Nonetheless, group discussion and problem solving can lead to better solutions and decisions when they are structured in such a way to facilitate the full participation of all
members. Some level of conflict seems to be necessary or at least helpful to reaching the best decision. It increases the chance that the group will outperform even its best member (process gain). In complex problem solving the larger the group the more likely there will be at least one person who knows how to solve the problem. Leaders can facilitate group accuracy by encouraging all members of a group to express their ideas.

When decision makers in schools are aware of the potential drawbacks of group decision making they can work to minimize the negative effects in order to capitalize on the potential benefits. In schools, collaboration can be difficult because of the norms of autonomy and equality among teachers and the difficulties inherent in changing beliefs and practices. In addition, group decision processes may be costly in terms of time and effort, and can be difficult to manage because of the emotions that are unleashed. But as school struggle to reinvent themselves to respond to the need of a changing world, making collaboration work may be schools’ best hope.

Trust and Collaboration

Trust is around the edges of many conversations about education and nowhere more frequently than when the conversation turns to participatory forms of governance. Trust and cooperation go hand in hand. The first empirical studies of trust operationalized trust as cooperation (Deutsch, 1958). Putnam (1993) noted trust within social communities not only facilitated cooperation but cooperation bred trust. He referred to this accumulation of collective trust as “social capital” and treated it as a very real asset that accrued to communities that had such trust.
Theoretical Links

Trust is increasingly recognized as vital for successful collaboration. It also takes time to build. The start of any collaborative process is likely to be marked by feelings of hostility, skepticism and a lack of trust that need to be overcome. Mattessich and Monsey (1992) advised,

At the very beginning collaborating partners should temporarily set aside the purpose of the collaboration and devote energy to learning about each other. Partners must present their intentions and agendas honestly and openly to bring out trust-building. Building strong relationships takes time. Set aside time to understand cultural context and membership (how language is used, how people are perceived). (p. 19)

Devoting a period of time to trust building at the start of a collaboration may have long term benefits.

The level of trust in a working group has been found to play a role in the group’s effectiveness (Zand, 1971). When a group worked on a problem, there are two concerns: one was the problem itself, the second was how the members related to each other about the problem. He found that in low trust groups, interpersonal relationships interfered with and distorted perceptions of the problem, while high trust groups solved problems more effectively. Rosen and Jerdee (1977) reported that trust mediated a manager’s willingness to use participative management practices. Where trust was absent managers were less likely to benefit from participants insights and perspectives.

By definition collaboration takes place between autonomous partners who choose whether or not to participate. Given this, it is unlikely that collaboration will develop without at least some level of trust. Although collaborative processes are increasingly called for as part of reform efforts in schools, these will not come about if the people involved do not trust
one another. Principal who do not trust their teachers will not share authority and responsibility. Teachers who do not trust one another will not give over a measure of their autonomy in order to collaborate with others. Teachers and principals who do not trust that parents have the best interest of the school at heart, and who don’t trust that parents are competent to assess and understand the obstacles and opportunities facing the school, will not welcome parents’ input as part of charting the course for the school’s future. Teachers who do not trust students will not involve them in making decisions about the class life together, nor will they construct learning experiences that vest responsibility for teaching and learning in the students’ group processes. Inversely, as principals, teachers, parents and students have opportunities for greater genuine participation this may fuel a spiral of trust that generates more trust.

**Hypotheses**

This study explores the relationship between trust and collaboration as they are played out in schools. The level of faculty trust in each of four major constituencies of schools: principal, teachers, parents, and students will be examined in relationship to the level of collaboration with those same four constituencies in a sample of urban elementary schools. It was predicted that the level of faculty trust in each of these constituencies would be positively related to the level of collaboration that existed at each level. The following hypotheses delineate more specifically this prediction.

H1: The level of faculty trust in the principal will be positively related to the level of collaboration between the principal and the faculty on school-level decisions.
H2: The level of faculty trust in colleagues will be positively related to the level of faculty collaboration with colleagues on classroom-level decisions.

H3: The level of faculty trust in students will be positively related to the level of shared governance within the classroom, and the level of cooperative-learning experiences teachers construct for students.

H4: The level of faculty trust in parents will be positively related to the level of collaboration between the school and parents in school-level decisions.

Multivariate statistical procedures, such as multiple regression and canonical correlation, were also employed to explore how the different levels of trust and collaboration function in concert.
Table 3.1: Definitions of collaboration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaboration</th>
<th>autonomous parties</th>
<th>equal status</th>
<th>structured process</th>
<th>commit resources</th>
<th>share responsibility</th>
<th>act or decide</th>
<th>common goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration is the development of the model of joint planning, joint implementation, and joint evaluation between individuals or organizations (The New England Program in Teacher Education, 1973).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration is a relational system of individuals within groups, in which: 1) individuals in a group share mutual aspirations and a common conceptual framework; 2) the interactions among individuals are characterized by justice and fairness; 3) these aspirations and conceptualizations are characterized by each individual's consciousness of his or her motives toward the other: by caring or concern for the other; and by commitment to work with the other over time provided that this commitment is a matter of choice (Appley &amp; Winder, 1977, p. 281).</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration implies the parties involved share responsibility and authority for basic policy decision making (Hoyt, 1978).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration occurs when two or more independent organizations agree to pool their authority, resources, and energies in order to achieve a goal or goals they desire (Intriligator, 1983, p.5).</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration is shared decision-making in governance, planning, delivery, and evaluation of programs. It is a pluralistic form of education where people of dissimilar backgrounds work together with equal status (The North Carolina Quality Assurance Program, 1983).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x x x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A partnership is a mutually collaborative arrangement between equal partners working together to meet self-interests while solving common problems (Sirotnik &amp; Goodlad, 1988).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration occurs when a group of autonomous stakeholders of a problem domain engage in an interactive process, using shared rules, norms, and structures, to act or decide on issues related to that domain (Wood &amp; Gray, 1991, p. 146).</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration is a mutually beneficial and well-defined relationship entered into by two or more organizations to achieve common goals. The relationship includes a commitment to: a definition of mutual relationships and goals; a jointly developed structure and shared responsibility; mutual authority and accountability for success; and sharing of resources and rewards (Mattessich &amp; Monsey, 1992).</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x x x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

Design of the Study

While some propose that quantitative and qualitative research methods stem from such different paradigms that they can have no useful interaction, others propose a "new synthesis" recognizing that qualitative and quantitative methods each bring a unique contribution to our knowing that can complement one another (Howe, 1990; Miller & Lieberman, 1988; Newman & Benz, 1998; Owens, 1982; Reichardt & Cook, 1979). Because of the complexity of social issues, both inductive as well as deductive methods, the broad though shallow knowing of quantitative methods, as well as the deep though narrow knowing of qualitative methods, contribute toward a more complete understanding (Newman & Benz, 1998; Salomon, 1991).

Ordinary science uses qualitative and quantitative knowing together to provide a depth of perception, or binocular vision, that neither one could provide alone. Far from being antagonistic, the two types of knowing are complementary....when used together for the same purpose, the two method-types can build upon each other to offer insights that neither one alone could provide. Since qualitative and quantitative methods often have different biases, each can be used to check on and learn from the other. (Reichardt & Cook, pp. 21, 23).

Although it may be informal, Newman and Benz point out that all quantitative studies in their inception have a qualitative element. The theories and hypotheses that are being tested
stem from some observation or hunch about the world. In the cyclical continuum of research they propose, Newman and Benz suggest that qualitative methods can again be employed following a quantitative exploration to go deeper and add complexity and richness to theory once it has been tested. This would be followed by yet another round of quantitative study to further test what has been discovered.

The present investigation stands in this tradition, seeing value in both qualitative and quantitative methods used in concert to enrich our understanding of the constructs under study. This current study utilized a concurrent multi-method design (Miller & Crabtree, 1994) to build on previous research and theory, going full circle on Newman and Benz’ interactive cycle of exploration and testing. Two phases make up the study: one a qualitative investigation using interview data from teachers in four schools, and the second, a quantitative investigation using two survey instruments based primarily on previous research. Data for both phases were collected within one large urban district in order to hold constant factors of district level organization and management. An urban district was chosen because it was expected that the greater levels of diversity and transience would make trust more of a challenge. Trust is most evident in its absence (Baier, 1986) and high variability in the levels of trust could be examined in relationship to the levels of collaboration.

Although there are a multiplicity of trust and collaborative relationships in schools that would be interesting to examine, the focus in this research was on the faculty’s perceptions of these constructs. Teacher perceptions of the level of faculty trust in four constituencies-- the principal, colleagues, students, and parents-- were examined, as well as teachers’ perceptions of the level of collaboration with those same four constituencies.
The Qualitative Study

Some aspects of trust are best discerned through qualitative research, especially the dynamic nature of trust, how it is developed, what breach has led to lost trust, and when and how trust was rebuilt. Dynamics particular to urban schools, issues related to diversity and transience, can be understood more fully through people’s experiences than through the stories that numbers alone can tell. The messiness and complexity of collaborative processes are best described through an exploration of people’s experiences with them. For example, teachers may be invited to participate in organizational decision making but then become disillusioned when they realize that the major decisions have already been made and that the participative process was a sham. In addition to the dynamics of trust in collaborative processes, exploration of related topics such as how trust-related incidents have affected participants’ organizational citizenship and communication patterns as well as some of the dysfunctional rules that have grown out of incidents of broken trust were also discussed.

Participants

Participants were selected through a process of theoretical or extreme case sampling (Patton 1990; Newman & Benz, 1998). Participants were nominated by an insider in the district with a broad knowledge of schools and personnel throughout the district. He nominated teachers in four schools, two where the trust among the faculty was high and two where the relationships were characterized by conflict. The results of the quantitative study confirmed the selection of the schools. Two of the schools, Brookside and Pine Grove, were in the top 10% in terms of overall trust scores in the sample of schools surveyed, two, Lincoln and Fremont, were in the bottom 30%.
Data were collected from three teachers in each of the four schools under study, for a total of twelve. In addition, data from a pilot interview were also included. An attempt was made to select participants with a range of perspectives in each school, people who varied along race and gender lines, as well as the length of their tenure as teachers. Figure 4.1 shows the blend of participants. Eight of the participants were female, five were male. Nine were white, while four were black. Three participants were novice teachers with five or fewer years of teaching experience, five had six to ten years of experience, two had from 11 to 19 years, and three had more than 20 years of teaching experience.

**Interview Protocol**

Interviews with teachers provided descriptions of how trust or distrust was lived in the professional lives of elementary teachers teaching in an urban context and the collaborative processes either present or absent in those contexts. Interviews were semi-structured, following an interview protocol designed to solicit responses on various aspects of trust and collaboration. The emphasis of the trust portion of the interviews was on the
dynamic nature of trust, how it is developed, incidents where it has been broken, and when
and how it was rebuilt. The collaboration portion of the interview explored not only what
collaborative structures existed but also participants affective reactions to participation in
those structures.

The interview protocol was reviewed by a panel of experts, four professors in the
College of Education at The Ohio State University. It was then pilot tested with a teacher
volunteer and reactions solicited. The protocol was modified based on the reactions of both
the experts and the teacher volunteer, rewording some questions to make them more open-
ended. See Appendix A for the interview protocol. Because of the semi-structured nature of
the interviews this protocol was further modified during the interviews in order to pursue
new issues as they emerged.

Data Collection

All of the teachers invited to participate in the study agreed to be interviewed. The
interviews were conducted during March, April, and May at the participants’ schools, usually
in their own classroom, after school or at a time when they had a break during the day.
Interviews generally lasted about an hour. In accordance with the Human Subjects Review
Board procedures, all interviews began with a description of the steps taken to protect the
confidentiality of respondents, and permission to tape record the interviews was requested.
Participants were then asked to sign a consent form. See Appendices B and C for interview
introduction and consent form. All notes and tapes were labeled only with pseudonyms.
Interview tapes were transcribed verbatim, however, some minor details were obscured when
they might have identified the participant.
Two levels of member checks were conducted. All participants were given an opportunity to read the transcript of their interview to make any corrections or revisions they wished. Level two member checks involved two participants, one from a high trust setting and the other from a low trust setting, reading a draft of the results chapter and making comments, suggestions or revisions.

Data Analysis

Data analysis utilized Nud*ist 4.0 for coding and analyzing interview data. Initial coding was done using a priori codes that grew out of the themes and patterns in the literature, with additional codes added as they emerged (Crabtree& Miller, 1992; Miles & Huberman, 1984). See Appendix D for the coding scheme. Analysis took place as segments of similar text were printed for subsequent reading and exploration. Attempts were made to look for disconfirming as well as confirming evidence (Erikson, 1986).

Triangulation adds credibility to a study based on the premise that weaknesses in any single method are compensated for by the counter-balancing strengths of another (Newman & Benz, 1998; Reichhardt & Cook, 1979). Triangulation occurred in two ways in this study. First, the interaction between the survey results and the interview data helped to test hypotheses and to provide explanations for surprising or perplexing findings. For example, the hypotheses that different dimensions of trust have differential levels of importance depending on the relative position of participants within a hierarchy was tested not only by the survey data but by making a frequency count of certain codes in the interview data (Crabtree& Miller, 1992; Erikson, 1986). Second, having the perspectives of three people represented within each school provided a richer understanding of the differential impact that
organizational dynamics can have on different people (Huberman & Miles, 1994; Newman & Benz, 1998).

A researcher's log was kept and memos were attached to the data files, leaving an audit trail of the analytic decisions that were made in the course of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). These methods helped to insure the trustworthiness of the qualitative data in this study.

The Quantitative Study

The focus of the quantitative phase of this study was on dimensions of collective trust and the relationship between trust and collaboration in schools. The school was the unit of analysis; therefore, teachers were asked for their perceptions of the level of trust and collaboration in the school, not their own personal feelings of trust or involvement with collaboration. Survey data were collected to test the hypotheses about the relationships between trust and collaboration in schools.

Pilot Study

The purpose of the pilot study was to test and refine two instruments under development, a trust survey and a collaboration survey. The trust and collaboration questionnaires were tested first by submitting them to a panel of experts and field tested with a group of teachers. The preliminary instruments were then tested among a sample of teachers known to differ on a variable thought to be related to the level of trust among faculty— the amount of conflict among the school staff. Factor analysis was done on the results to determine the usefulness and appropriateness of the items. Items were eliminated or reworded based on the results of these various tests. The validity of the measures was
further tested by correlating the results of the pilot instruments to other constructs that were hypothesized to be either similar or dissimilar to the constructs under study.

Although trust and collaboration have been examined previously in schools, none of the existing measures of these constructs were suitable for this study. This was because the definitions for these constructs used in this study are somewhat different than in previous research, and because no existing measure encompassed all four of the constituencies (principal, colleagues, parents, and students) as referents of trust and collaboration that this study sought to explore.

**Trust survey.** In this study trust was defined as one party’s willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the belief that the latter party is (a) benevolent, (b) reliable, (c) competent, (d) honest, and (e) open. Trust in schools has been studied using the Trust Scales (Hoy & Kupersmith, 1985) that explore faculty trust in the principal and faculty trust in colleagues. The trust survey developed in this study built on that instrument, expanding it to explore additional dimensions of trust as well as two additional constituencies: faculty trust in parents and in students. The format of the Trust Scales was maintained, a six-point Likert response set from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Sample items from each of the four levels of trust being measured include:

- The principal is unresponsive to teachers’ concerns.
- Teachers in this school are reliable.
- Teachers in this school are suspicious of students.
- Teachers in this school trust the parents.
Items were developed that assessed each of the five proposed dimensions of trust as well as global statements of trust or distrust to determine whether these various dimensions could be said to belong to a judgment about trust.

**Collaboration survey.** Collaboration in this study was defined as the extent to which teachers perceived that they (and parents and students) were not only involved but exercised influence over school and classroom-level decisions. Four collaborative processes in schools were explored in this study: collaboration between the principal and teachers on school-level decisions, collaboration between teachers on class-level decisions, collaboration with parents on school-level decisions, and collaboration with students on class-level decisions. School-level decisions included issues such as budgets, hiring, scheduling, and policies. Class-level decisions included issues such as curriculum, activities, and discipline. Although teachers are not likely the ones to make decisions about the involvement of parents in school-level decisions, it is assumed that they would have reasonably accurate perceptions of the level of parent collaboration.

A two-part instrument was used in the pilot study. Both involvement and influence were assessed. Teachers were asked their perceptions of the level of involvement in decision making at each of the four levels and about the perceived influence in each of the decision realms. The decision domains grew out of previous studies of shared decision making in schools; however, the items were modified to encompass both parents and students in addition to teachers (Conley, Schmiddle, & Shedd, 1988; Mohrman, Cooke, & Mohrman, 1978; Sabo, Barnes, & Hoy, 1996). A 4-point Likert scale was used for involvement and for
influence. A sample of the decisions domains principals and teachers were asked to rate for both involvement and influence were:

To what extent do teachers have influence over the outcome of these types of decisions?
- Selecting personnel
- Planning school improvement

To what extent are teacher committees involved in decisions of this kind?
- Determining professional development needs and goals
- Evaluating curriculum and programs

To what extent do parents have influence over the outcome of these types of decisions?
- Planning school improvement
- Determining curriculum priorities

To what extent are students involved in these decisions?
- Determining consequences for classroom rule-breaking
- Evaluation of student work

To explore whether the level of trust and collaboration in a school had any relationship to the use of cooperative learning methods, four items assessing the use of such methods were added. Sample items include:

To what extent do teachers use these cooperative learning methods?
- Small group learning experiences.
- Interdependent reward structures for group work.

Collaboration has been a difficult construct to define and to measure. Calls for greater participation in decision making by teachers in schools have begun to be supplanted with
calls for collaboration because participation alone has not meant that teachers had a real voice in the decisions that affected them. Often teachers have complained that they have invested time and energy in participatory decision processes only to have the decisions made by principals or other organizational participants at higher levels in the hierarchy (Bartunek & Keys, 1979; Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1988; Duke, Showers, & Imber, 1980). By assessing both involvement and influence this measure attempted to discern a subtle but significant difference in decision making practices within schools.

**Content validity.** The content validity of the two survey instruments was tested by submitting them to review by a panel of experts, all professors at The Ohio State University (Kerlinger, 1986). The panel of experts for the trust survey included four professors from the College of Education, and one, a scholar of trust in organizations from the College of Business. For the collaboration survey the panel included the four College of Education professors and two from the Department of Psychology-- one who specialized in decision making and the other in organizational effectiveness.

The reviewers were given a list of the instrument items on a grid with the dimensions or elements of trust (adapted from Table 2.1) and a description of each of the elements. They were asked to judge which of the elements each of the items captured. The results are reported Table 4.1. (and in the second column of Table 4.2). Where the experts disagreed, both elements are reported. This allowed the assessment of whether each item belonged to the construct it was intended to measure, whether any aspects were over-represented or under-represented, and helped to insure that each element was tapped at each of the four levels.
The collaboration measure was given to the panel of experts to determine if the decision domains reasonably covered the kinds of decisions made in schools and whether the method of asking about both participation and influence seemed a promising approach to assess whether participation was collaborative. All members of the panel of experts agreed that it was a reasonable approach.

Field test. A field test was conducted to test the clarity of instructions, appropriateness of the response set, length, and face validity of the items. Six experienced teachers were asked to respond to the instruments and to give feedback on these issues and any other perceptions they wished to share. Questions or concerns that were raised are indicated on Table 4.2 and 4.3 with the symbol [FT]. In some instances the specific comments made were included in order to show how the item was subsequently modified to address the concern or why the item was eliminated. For example, on TPA2, “Teachers in this school trust parents,” a field test participant queried “to do what?” That item was reworded to read “Teachers in this school trust parents to support them.” Thus it was changed from a general statement of trust to one more specifically tapping the benevolence dimension.

Factor analysis and reliabilities. The trust and the collaboration surveys were each submitted to a factor analysis using principal components analysis to test whether each item loaded strongly and as expected with other like items. Results are reported in Tables 4.2 and 4.3. Using a scree plot analysis three trust factors emerged with eigenvalues over 1. On the whole, factor loadings were strong and loaded together with other items from the same subtest. The one surprising finding was that the trust in students and trust in parents items loaded
together on one factor, and as a result they were combined. This factor was called "Trust in Clients" because both students and parents were viewed as recipients of the services offered by schools. A factor analysis of all the collaboration items resulted in four factors with eigenvalues over 1.0. Factor loadings for the four factor solution are reported in Table 4.3.

Decisions of whether to retain, eliminate or modify each of the items were made based on factor loadings. Where items were found to load on more than one factor at .40 or above the item was generally removed (coded [DL] for dual loading), but in a few cases the item was retained for conceptual reasons or was modified. For example TS7 "Teachers in this school trust their students" loaded strongly on factor 2 at .75 but also loaded on factor 3 at .43. This item was retained to see if an overall statement of trust would be related to each of the proposed dimensions of trust. Items that loaded lower than .40 on any factor were also removed (coded [LL] for low loading). Items were also removed where there was another item that tapped the same dimension but had a higher factor loading (coded [RI] for redundant item). For example, TPR5r "The principal takes unfair advantage of the teachers in this school" had a strong factor loading of .73; however, there were two other items that also tapped the benevolence dimension, one of which was also negatively worded, so the item was eliminated. Also, where items loaded on factors other than expected they were removed (these were coded [UL] for unexpected loading), for example, DMTV/F13 "Resolving problems with community groups" loaded with the classroom-level decisions rather than school-level decisions. Shaded items in the table are items that were removed.

As a result of the pilot study analysis four items from the Trust in the Principal scale were discarded as were three from Trust in Colleagues. In the new Trust in Clients factor,
two items concerning trust in students and two concerning trust in parents were removed.

One item tapping trust in parents was reworded, and two new items were added, one referring to trust in students and one to trust in parents. Some of the eliminated items revealed interesting patterns. Whether teachers shared information about their lives outside of school with their colleagues was not strongly related to other trust factors. And when teachers were asked whether they would feel comfortable putting their own child in their school, judgments of their colleagues’ competence was confounded with trust for clients. Teachers were apparently as concerned about their level of trust in students as in their trust in colleagues in determining how comfortable they would be in enrolling their own child in the school.

On the collaboration survey the attempt to measure both participation and influence using teacher perceptions was abandoned because of the high correlation of the two and the impossibility of discerning whether that was due to methodological bias or true variance. A new strategy was employed in the revised instruments. Principals were asked to report on the level of participation in the school and teachers were asked to rate the perceived level of influence. In addition, in the Collaboration with the Principal subscale, six school-level decision domains were discarded, as were five classroom-level decision domains from the Collaboration with Colleagues subscale because of the lack of a clear differentiation between school-level and classroom-level decisions. All items referring to collaboration with parents and with students were retained.

The reliabilities for the three subscales of the trust survey were all high. Cronbach’s alpha for Trust in the Principal was .95, for Trust in Colleagues was .94, and for Trust in
Clients was .92. The alphas were calculated with the shaded items removed. Previous research using the Trust Scales has reported alpha coefficients ranging from .89 to .97 for faculty trust in the principal, and .92 to .97 for faculty trust in colleagues. The reliabilities for the new measures were considered good. The reliabilities for the four subsections of the collaboration survey, with the shaded items removed, were also considered good. Collaboration on school-level decisions was .87, on classroom-level decisions was .88, collaboration with parents had a reliability of .94, and collaboration with students had a reliability of .86.

The modifications based on the field test, panel of experts, and statistical analysis of the pilot test data resulted in two reasonable and reliable measures. Next the validity of these scales was examined.

The method of known groups. The method of known groups was used as a validation technique in this study to assess whether the trust instrument was sufficiently sensitive to variations in the population under study (Rokeach, 1960). A nonrandom sample of 50 teachers was selected because they varied in the level of perceived conflict within their schools. The teachers each came from different schools and their perceptions were assumed to represent the school. Roughly half of the respondents expressed agreement with a statement on the questionnaire describing a school with a nonproductive level of conflict while half indicated their school more closely resembled the description of a school with productive working relationships. Statistical analysis revealed that school conflict was significantly negatively related to trust in the principal \((r = -.28, p < .05)\), trust in colleagues \((r = -.76, p < .01)\), and trust in clients \((r = -.56, p < .01)\). See Table 4.4. It was determined that
the trust instrument had been adequately sensitive to the variations between these two groups of teachers.

**Discriminant validity.** Participants in the pilot study were asked to respond not only to the two measures of trust and collaboration but also to three additional instruments to test the discriminant validity of these measures (Kerlinger, 1986). Discriminant validity for trust was measured using a survey of work alienation because alienation was presumed to be conceptually distinct from trust. “Work alienation is defined in terms of the extent to which individuals fail to experience intrinsic pride or meaning in their work” (Forsyth & Hoy, 1978, p. 85). Results indicated that work alienation was significantly negatively related to Trust in Colleagues \( r = -.31, p < .05 \) and Trust in Clients \( r = -.31, p < .05 \). The negative sign of the correlations indicated that the higher the level of trust in colleagues and in clients, the lower was the overall work alienation. Work alienation was not significantly related to Trust in the Principal. Although it was expected that work alienation would be related to all three aspects of trust, that it was related to two of the three and in the expected direction, was considered acceptable. See Table 4.4.

Discriminant validity of collaboration was measured using a survey of powerlessness (Zielinski & Hoy, 1983) because those without influence were hypothesized to feel powerless. Six of the twenty item index of powerlessness were used. The measure of collaboration was significantly negatively related to powerlessness for collaboration with the principal \( r = -.43, p < .01 \), with colleagues \( r = -.54, p < .01 \), and with parents \( r = -.40, p < .01 \). Collaboration with students was not significantly related to powerlessness. This was
an acceptable indication that collaboration, as measured by this new instrument, was conceptually related but distinct from powerlessness. See Table 4.5.

Both the collaboration and trust measures were expected to be positively correlated with the school decisions subsection of Bandura’s teacher self-efficacy scale (Bandura, unpublished). Self-efficacy is defined as "a cognitive process of self-attribution in which people construct beliefs about one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments" (Bandura, 1977). In a high trust environment it was expected that teachers would develop a greater sense of efficacy. Teachers’ sense of efficacy was significantly and positively related to Trust in the Principal ($r = .46$, $p < .01$), Trust in Colleagues ($r = .30$, $p < .05$), and Trust in Clients ($r = .47$, $p < .01$). The ability to influence the outcomes of events is conceptually similar to participation in a decision making structure, so collaboration and efficacy were expected to statistically converge. Teachers’ sense of efficacy was related to Collaboration with the Principal ($r = .36$, $p < .05$), Colleagues ($r = .53$, $p < .01$), Parents ($r = .26$, $p < .05$) and Students ($r = .30$, $p < .05$). See Tables 4.4 and 4.5. This was not a complete test of the network of related constructs but provides a beginning analysis. Based on these preliminary findings it was concluded that these two new measures were reasonably valid measures of trust and collaboration.

The pilot study was undertaken to refine these two newly developed instruments. The content analysis assured that the items reasonably covered the domains being measured. The method of known groups demonstrated that the instruments were sensitive to known variations within a sample. The field test and statistical analysis helped to clarify the instruments by eliminating items that were not strongly related to factors tapped by the
measures, that tapped dimensions that were measured better by other items, or that were ambiguous to participants. Two major changes in the instruments grew out of the pilot study. First two subscales of the trust survey were combined to form one new subscale--Trust in Clients. Second, the attempt to measure both participation and influence using teacher perceptions was abandoned and a new strategy of assessing the level of decision participation by asking the principals was employed. The pilot study produced evidence of the validity and reliability of the measures. This process of testing resulted in more concise and clearer measures.

Conducting the Study

The quantitative study made use of the trust and collaboration measures described above to gather data on a sample of elementary schools within one large urban district in a Midwestern state. The sample, data collection, and data analysis techniques are described below.

Power analysis. The power analysis to determine the sample size necessary to detect certain effect sizes was calculated using an estimate of omega squared (Keppel, 1991). Omega squared is calculated as the percent of variance explained in the population based on estimates from previous research. In prior studies of trust in schools the correlations for Trust in the Principal ranged from .53 to .83, with an average of .73 or R² of .54, while Trust in Colleagues ranged from .44 to .66 with an average of .57 or R² of .33 (Hoffman, Sabo, Bliss, & Hoy, 1994; Hoy, Sabo, & Banes, 1996; Tarter, Bliss, & Hoy, 1989). In these studies the shrunken R² was not reported, which would be a closer approximation of omega squared. Therefore, although there was evidence of effect sizes that were in excess of what is
considered a large effect (.15), as a more conservative estimate of a medium effect size (.06) was used in the power analysis (Keppel, 1991).

\[
\phi^2 = \frac{n \cdot \omega}{1 - \omega}
\]

\[
\phi^2 = \frac{n \cdot .06}{.94}
\]

if \( n' = 45 \) then \( \phi = 1.698 \) for \( \alpha = .05 \).

Power = .82 for \( df_{num} = 4 \) and \( df_{den} = 30 \)

Power of .80 or higher is generally accepted as adequate for social science research, so a sample size of 45 was deemed to be adequate. With a large effect size a sample of 22 would yield power of .90 at \( \alpha = .05 \). Therefore a sample size of 45 was considered more than adequate to detect the effects anticipated in this study.

The sample. The population for this study was the elementary schools within one large urban school district. Permission to conduct research was requested following school district procedures. Schools were selected at random. Ninety percent of the schools contacted agreed to participate, resulting in a sample of 50 schools. Elementary principals were provided with a description of the research project in advance of the faculty meeting where data were collected; they were assured of confidentiality and given the opportunity to have any questions answered. Halpin (1959) provided evidence that average scores of descriptive questionnaire items such as the LBDQ computed on the basis of 5-7 respondents per school yield reasonably stable scores (p.28), so schools with fewer than five teachers responding to either instruments were not used. Of the 50 schools surveyed 45 returned a sufficient number
of each of the two surveys to be included in the sample. A total of 898 teachers completed surveys and over 99% of forms returned were useable.

**Data collection.** Data for the quantitative phase of this investigation were collected from 50 urban elementary schools in one Midwestern district. At a regularly scheduled faculty meeting (or an early release professional development meeting) in February, March or April a member of the research team explained the purpose of the study, assured the confidentiality of all participants, and requested that the teachers complete the surveys. See Appendix E for a example of the directions given. The instruments, which had been printed on scannable forms, were distributed along with No. 2 pencils. Half the teachers present responded to the trust questionnaire and half completed the questionnaire on collaboration. The separation was to assure methodological independence of the responses. No attempt was made to gather data from faculty who were not present at the meetings. Small chocolate candies were distributed to teachers as they completed the questionnaires to express gratitude for their participation, but these were not mentioned and were kept out of sight until the surveys were completed.

The principal was also asked to complete a questionnaire. This questionnaire asked the principal whether committees existed in which teachers or parents were involved in the various school-level decision domains, and whether teacher committees and students were involved in the various classroom-level decision domains. Involvement in each decision domain was assessed as a dichotomous variable and scores were summed within each subscale to provide an index of involvement. Principals were also asked to supply demographic information about the school, such as number of students and teachers, racial
and socioeconomic characteristics of the students and the rate of student mobility. See Appendix F, G and H for the survey forms.

Data analysis. The focus of this study was on the collective – the patterns, practices, and processes of interpersonal relationships among schools; thus the school was the unit of analysis. First, the interrelationships between three levels of trust were examined using Pearson Product Moment correlations to see if patterns emerged in the trust relationships among schools. For example, does strong faculty trust in the principal tend to be related to strong trust at other levels of the school or are the quality of relationships at various levels fairly distinct. A similar analysis examined the interrelationships of the levels of collaboration. Next, a correlational analysis of the relationships between each level of trust and the corresponding level of collaboration tested the hypotheses that these were positively related. Specifically, it was predicted that trust in the principal would be positively related to collaboration with the principal on school-level decisions, that trust in colleagues would be related to collaboration with colleagues on classroom-level decisions. It was also predicted that trust in clients would be related to collaboration with parents and with students, as well as to cooperative learning experiences in the classroom.

Third, multiple regression was used to explore how the three levels of trust played out differentially in each level of collaboration. For example, what is the relative importance of each of the three levels of trust on collaboration between the principal and teachers? How much more of the variance, for example, is explained in teachers’ collaboration with one another when all three levels of trust are included in an equation as opposed to just faculty trust in colleagues? Does faculty trust in various constituencies compound to a school-wide
atmosphere of trust (or distrust)? For purpose of analysis trust was treated as the independent variable; however, trust and collaboration are proposed as reciprocal processes, each creating the other.

Finally, canonical correlation was conducted to compare the set of trust variables to the set of collaboration variables, weighing the relative weights of each of the trust and collaboration dimensions in an equation when all seven variables were included. A canonical correlation exploring the importance of demographic factors such as racial diversity, student mobility, and student socioeconomic status was also calculated. The results of these various analyses were anticipated to provide a greater understanding of the relationships between trust and collaboration within and among various school constituencies.

Significance of the Study

The problems schools face are difficult and complex. They stem from changing sets of expectations and the need to adapt to a diverse and rapidly changing world. No person can solve these problems alone. Finding answers requires the participation of teachers, principals, superintendents, school board members and other school personnel, as well as parents, legislators, business and civic groups, and even students. If these groups do not trust one another collaboration will be difficult. This study contributes to an understanding of the dynamics of trust and collaboration in schools. In addition, the relationship of other organizational processes such as communication and organizational citizenship that are related to the level of trust among participants were also examined. Although this investigation is exploratory, a greater understanding of these organizational dynamics will be important as schools face the challenges ahead.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item code</th>
<th>Faculty Trust in the Principal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPR15_52</td>
<td>Teachers in this school can rely on the principal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR14r_50</td>
<td>The principal is unresponsive to teachers’ concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR3_12</td>
<td>Teachers in this school trust the principal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR4_20</td>
<td>The principal in this school keeps his or her word.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR8_35</td>
<td>The principal in this school typically acts with the best interests of the teachers in mind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR7r_29</td>
<td>The principal of this school does not show concern for the teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR11r_43</td>
<td>The principal doesn’t tell teachers what is really going on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR6_26</td>
<td>The teachers in this school have faith in the integrity of the principal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR5r_22</td>
<td>The principal takes unfair advantage of the teachers in this school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR9r_36</td>
<td>The teachers in this school are suspicious of most of the principal’s actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR13_46</td>
<td>The principal in this school is competent in doing his or her job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR12r_45</td>
<td>Teachers in this school often question the motives of the principal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR1_1</td>
<td>The principal openly shares personal information with teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR2_7</td>
<td>When the principal commits to something teachers can be sure it will get done.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR10_37</td>
<td>Teachers feel comfortable admitting to the principal they have made a mistake.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item code</th>
<th>Faculty Trust in Colleagues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TT10_27</td>
<td>Teachers in this school believe in each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT14_53</td>
<td>Even in difficult situations, teachers in this school can depend on each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT12_41</td>
<td>Teachers in this school are open with each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT4_13</td>
<td>When teachers in this school tell you something you can believe it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT1_2</td>
<td>Teachers in this school trust each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT9_25</td>
<td>Teachers in this school typically look out for each other.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: An analysis of trust elements. (Continued)
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>benevolence</th>
<th>reliability</th>
<th>competence</th>
<th>honesty</th>
<th>openness</th>
<th>willing to risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TT5_15</td>
<td>Teachers in this school have faith in the integrity of their colleagues.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT2r_8</td>
<td>Teachers here only trust the people in their clique.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT7_19</td>
<td>If I had a school-aged child, I would feel comfortable putting my own child in most anyone’s classroom in this school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT13r_49</td>
<td>Teachers take unfair advantage of each other in this school.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT8r_21</td>
<td>Teachers in this school are suspicious of each other.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT11_33</td>
<td>Teachers in this school are reliable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT3_11</td>
<td>Teachers in this school do their jobs well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT6r_16</td>
<td>Teachers in this school don’t share much about their lives outside of school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty Trust in Clients**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>benevolence</th>
<th>reliability</th>
<th>competence</th>
<th>honesty</th>
<th>openness</th>
<th>willing to risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TS2_5</td>
<td>Students in this school are reliable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS1_3</td>
<td>Students in this school can be counted on.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS7_44</td>
<td>Teachers in this school trust their students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS10r_55</td>
<td>The students in this school have to be closely supervised.</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS11_59</td>
<td>Students are caring toward one another.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS12_60</td>
<td>Students here are secretive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS9r_54</td>
<td>Students in this school cheat if they have the chance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS6_17</td>
<td>Students in this school can be counted on to do their work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS8r_51</td>
<td>Teachers in this school are suspicious of students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS4_10</td>
<td>Teachers in this school show concern for their students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS5_14</td>
<td>Teachers in this school believe what students say.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS3_6</td>
<td>The students in this school talk freely about their lives outside of school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Teachers here believe students are competent learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPA4_40</td>
<td>Teachers think most of the parents do a good job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPA7_61</td>
<td>Parents in this school are reliable in their commitments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPA3_31</td>
<td>Teachers can count on the parents in this school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPA1r_4</td>
<td>Teachers avoid making contact with parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPA6r_56</td>
<td>Teachers are suspicious of parents’ motives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPA2_9</td>
<td>Teachers in this school trust the parents (to support them).</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPA5r_42</td>
<td>Teachers are guarded in what they say to parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New</td>
<td>Teachers can believe what parents tell them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Key to Tables 4.2, 4.3, 6.1, and 6.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item code</th>
<th>Elements of Trust</th>
<th>Reason for rejection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPR</td>
<td>Trust in principal</td>
<td>B Benevolence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>Trust in colleagues</td>
<td>R Reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>Trust in students</td>
<td>C Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPA</td>
<td>Trust in parents</td>
<td>H Honesty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>Reverse coded item (on end)</td>
<td>O Openness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDM</td>
<td>Shared decision making</td>
<td>WV Willing to be vulnerable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item code</td>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR15</td>
<td>Teachers in this school can rely on the principal.</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR14r</td>
<td>The principal is unresponsive to teachers' concerns.</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR3</td>
<td>Teachers in this school trust the principal.</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR4</td>
<td>The principal in this school keeps his or her word.</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR8</td>
<td>The principal in this school typically acts with the best interests of the teachers in mind.</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR7r</td>
<td>The principal of this school does not show concern for the teachers.</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR11r</td>
<td>The principal doesn’t tell teachers what is really going on.</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR 6</td>
<td>The teachers in this school have faith in the integrity of the principal.</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR5r</td>
<td>The principal takes unfair advantage of the teachers in this school.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR9r</td>
<td>The teachers in this school are suspicious of most of the principal’s actions.</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR13</td>
<td>The principal in this school is competent in doing his or her job.</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR12r</td>
<td>Teachers in this school often question the motives of the principal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR1</td>
<td>The principal openly shares personal information with teachers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR2</td>
<td>When the principal commits to something teachers can be sure it will get done.</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR10</td>
<td>Teachers feel comfortable admitting to the principal they have made a mistake.</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty Trust in Colleagues**  
Alpha = .94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item code</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>F1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TT10</td>
<td>Teachers in this school believe in each other.</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT14</td>
<td>Even in difficult situations, teachers in this school can depend on each other.</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT12</td>
<td>Teachers in this school are open with each other.</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT4</td>
<td>When teachers in this school tell you something you can believe it.</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT1</td>
<td>Teachers in this school trust each other.</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT9</td>
<td>Teachers in this school typically look out for each other.</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT5</td>
<td>Teachers in this school have faith in the integrity of their colleagues.</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. 2: Pilot study trust item analysis.  
(Continued)
Table 4.2: Pilot study trust item analysis (Continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Dim.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TT2r</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>8. Teachers here only trust the people in their clique. [FT]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT7</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>19. <em>If I had a school-aged child, I would feel comfortable putting my own child in most anyone’s classroom in this school.</em> [DL]</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT13r</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>49. Teachers take unfair advantage of each other in this school. [DL, RI]</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT8r</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>21. Teachers in <em>this school are suspicious of each other.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT11</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>33. Teachers in this school are reliable. [FT, DL, RI]</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT3</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>11. Teachers in this school do their jobs well. [DL but OK]</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT8r</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>16. Teachers in this school don’t share much about their lives outside of school. [LL, UL]</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty Trust in Clients**

*Alpha = .92*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Dim.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TS2</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>5. Students in this school are reliable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>3. Students in this school can be counted on. [RI, FT &quot;For what&quot;]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS7</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>44. Teachers in this school trust their students. [DL but OK]</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS10r</td>
<td>WV/R</td>
<td>55. The students in this school have to be closely supervised.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS11</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>59. Students are caring toward one another.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS12</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>60. Students here are secretive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS9r</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>54. Students in this school cheat if they have the chance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS6</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>17. Students in this school can be counted on to do their work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS8r</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>51. Teachers in this school are suspicious of students. [RI]</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>10. Teachers in this school show concern for their students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS5</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>14. Teachers in this school believe what students say. [DL but OK]</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS3</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>6. <em>The students in this school talk freely about their lives outside of school.</em> [LL, FT &quot;With whom?&quot;–Keep for info only]</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New: Teachers here believe students are competent learners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPA4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>40. Teachers think most of the parents do a good job.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPA7</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>61. Parents in this school are reliable in their commitments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPA3</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>31. Teachers can count on the parents in this school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPA1r</td>
<td>O/WV</td>
<td>4. Teachers avoid making contact with parents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPA6r</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>56. Teachers are suspicious of parents’ motives. [RI]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPA2</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>9. Teachers in this school trust the parents. [DL, FT: &quot;To do what?&quot;]</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Reworded: 9. Teachers in this school trust the parents to support them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPA5r</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>42. Teachers are guarded in what they say to parents. [LL, RI]</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H</td>
<td>New: Teachers can believe what parents tell them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{Item} & \text{Decision Domain} & \text{F1} & \text{F2} & \text{F3} & \text{F4} \\
\hline
\text{DMTV/F 7} & \text{Determining criteria for selecting personnel} & .80 & & & \\
\text{DMTV/F 8} & \text{Selecting personnel} & .77 & & & \\
\text{DMTV/F 9} & \text{Assigning and reassigning personnel} & .70 & & & \\
\text{DMTV/F 15} & \text{Designing building modifications} & .65 & & & \\
\text{DMTV/F 10} & \text{Evaluating personnel} & .59 & & & \\
\text{DMTV/F 14} & \text{Planning school improvement} & .59 & & & \\
\text{DMTV/F 11} & \text{Determining how to allocate space} & .54 & & & \\
\text{DMTV/F 11} & \text{Determining criteria for removing personnel [LL, RI]} & .51 & & & \\
\text{DMTV/F 5} & \text{Determining how to allocate financial resources [DL, modified]} & .57 & .43 & & \\
\text{DMTV/F 13} & \text{Resolving problems with community groups [LL, UL]} & .56 & & & \\
\text{DMTV/F 1} & \text{Determining areas in need of improvement [DL]} & .53 & .40 & & \\
\text{DMTV/F 3} & \text{Identifying resources for school improvement [DL]} & .53 & .46 & & \\
\text{DMTV/F 4} & \text{Determining how to allocate time (e.g. scheduling, calendar) [DL, modified]} & .51 & .45 & & \\
\text{DMTV/F 6} & \text{Determining personnel needs [LL, UL]} & .47 & & & \\
\text{DMTV/F 12} & \text{Settling employee grievances [LL, UL]} & .47 & & & \\
\text{DMTV/F 13} & \text{Resolving student behavior problems} & .78 & & & \\
\text{DMTV/F 12} & \text{Resolving student learning problems} & .77 & & & \\
\text{DMTV/F 5} & \text{Planning professional development activities} & .66 & & & \\
\text{DMTV/F 13} & \text{Determining consequences for rule-breaking} & .64 & & & \\
\text{DMTV/F 15} & \text{Developing procedures for reporting student progress to parents} & .64 & & & \\
\text{DMTV/F 11} & \text{Determining school rules} & .62 & & & \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Collective Decision Making With Teacher Colleagues
To what extent do teacher committees influence decisions of this kind?
Alpha = .88

Table 4.3: Pilot study collaboration item analysis.
Table 4.3: Pilot study collaboration item analysis (Continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Decision Domain</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMCV/F 8</td>
<td>Selecting instructional methods and activities</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMCV/F 4</td>
<td>Determining professional development needs and goals</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMCV/F 14</td>
<td>Determining grading procedures for examining student progress [DL]</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMCV/F 6</td>
<td>Determining curriculum outcome or goals [DL]</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMCV/F 11</td>
<td>Evaluating curriculum and programs</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMCV/F 10</td>
<td>Determining how to allocate instructional resources [DL, LL]</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMCV/F 7</td>
<td>Selecting curriculum content [DL]</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMCV/F 9</td>
<td>Selecting instructional materials and technology [DL, LL]</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parents and School Decisions
To what extent do parents have influence over the outcome of these decisions?
Alpha = .94

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Decision Domain</th>
<th>F1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMPV/F 1</td>
<td>Determining areas in need of improvement</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMPV/F 2</td>
<td>Planning school improvement</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMPV/F 3</td>
<td>Determining curriculum priorities</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMPV/F 7</td>
<td>Determining school rules and regulations</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMPV/F 6</td>
<td>Resolving problems with community groups</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMPV/F 5</td>
<td>Fostering community relations</td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMPV/F 8</td>
<td>Determining how to comply with mandates, legislation, etc</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMPV/F 9</td>
<td>Approving extracurricular activities</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMPV/F 4</td>
<td>Determining how to allocate resources (the school budget)</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Students in Classroom Decisions
To what extent do students have influence in these decisions?
Alpha = .86

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Decision Domain</th>
<th>F1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DMSV/F 5</td>
<td>Evaluation of student work</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMSV/F 3</td>
<td>Selecting curriculum content</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMSV/F 4</td>
<td>Selecting instructional methods and activities</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMSV/F 1</td>
<td>Determining classroom rules</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMSV/F 2</td>
<td>Determining consequences for classroom rule-breaking</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMSV/F 6</td>
<td>Resolving student behavior problems</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
N = 50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Alienation</td>
<td>.420**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.355*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.224</td>
<td>-.308*</td>
<td>-.306*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Powerlessness</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.551**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.381**</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.472**</td>
<td>-.317*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bandura's Teacher Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.280*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.456**</td>
<td>.304*</td>
<td>.473**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. School Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.278*</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.763**</td>
<td>-.557**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Trust in Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.541**</td>
<td>.395**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Trust in Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.621**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Trust in Clients</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01

Table 4.4: Intercorrelations between subscales for trust and validation variables for pilot study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Alienation</td>
<td>.420**</td>
<td>- .609**</td>
<td>.355*</td>
<td>- .122</td>
<td>- .185</td>
<td>- .307*</td>
<td>- .053</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Bandura's Teacher Efficacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>- .280*</td>
<td>- .356*</td>
<td>.255*</td>
<td>.534**</td>
<td>.308*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. School Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- .298*</td>
<td>- .202</td>
<td>- .229</td>
<td>- .147</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Collaboration with Principal on school decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.268*</td>
<td>.581**</td>
<td>.270*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Collaboration with parents on school decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.373**</td>
<td>.356**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Collaboration with colleagues on classroom decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.330*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Collaboration with students on classroom decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$

Table 4.5: Intercorrelations between subscales for collaboration and validation variables for pilot study.
CHAPTER 5

QUALITATIVE RESULTS

As in any study, this one examines only a narrow slice of the constructs under study. Anyone who is acquainted with a teacher doubtless has heard stories of trust, betrayal, and revenge in schools. The stories on these pages are only a few of the thousands of stories that could be told about how trust was developed and lost in the schools of just this one urban district. What makes the stories told by these thirteen teachers instructive is that they were systematically collected and analyzed with an interest in the sources and dynamics of trust as it is lived in schools. From them we look to gain insight into the role that trust plays in the working relationships of teachers with their colleagues, their principals, their students, and the parents of their students.

Trust Sources Across Organizational Roles

In Chapter Two a five-dimensional model of trust was proposed. In this model trust judgments are made based on an assessment of the other person’s benevolence, reliability, competence, honesty, and openness. How much weight each of these assessments plays in an overall trust judgment depends on the nature of the vulnerability between the two parties. When people occupy different levels within a hierarchy there are different expectations for what they owe to other organizational participants and about what others owe them. This
impacts the trust relationships because the interdependence of people at different organizational levels differs. Researchers in two previous studies found that people at different hierarchical levels look for and weigh sources of trust differently for different referent groups (Gabarro, 1978; Kramer, 1996). If patterns found in other types of organizations were to hold, it was expected that teachers would look for evidence of concern (benevolence) and for a willingness to share information (openness) as the most important bases of trust in principals. At the same time, as superiors “trusting down” the hierarchy to their subordinates—the students, it was expected that teachers would be more concerned with the competence and reliability of their pupils. It was also expected that teachers would look for integrity or honesty in making trust judgments of those both above and below them in the hierarchy (Gabarro).

In this study different sources of trust did, in fact, seem to take on differing amounts of importance for teachers across hierarchical levels. When a count was made of how many times each of the five elements were mentioned in the interviews, the profile for each of the referent groups (principal, colleagues, and students and parents) varied, as demonstrated in Figure 5.1. Trust relationships in elementary schools apparently do not follow precisely those patterns found in other organizations. In accordance with expectations from previous research, benevolence or supportiveness was a frequently mentioned factor of trust in the principal. Openness also played a role but was not as strong. Contrary to previous findings, the competence of the principal was a major factor in faculty trust of the principal, while honesty or integrity was less often mentioned.
Figure 5.1 Elements of Trust

Benevolence and openness were also the trust dimensions that seemed to play the largest role in teachers trust judgments of their colleagues. Openness referred to the willingness to share teaching ideas and resources, but in reference to colleagues it also meant sharing information about one another’s lives outside of school. The willingness to share information about one’s personal life was an indicator of a high level of trust among a faculty, while that kind of openness was rarely expected or mentioned in reference to the principal. Competence and reliability were much less frequently mentioned as important
elements in trust in colleagues. Honesty again was not often mentioned as an issue in trust. Unless there was an incident in which the honesty of a colleagues was called into question, it seemed to be assumed.

Comments made during the interviews resonated with what was found during the pilot study, that trust in parent and trust in students are closely related in the minds of teachers. Consequently the analysis will refer to both under the general heading of trust in clients. When teachers talked about trust in students and in parents they very often talked about respect. This was coded as benevolence or good will but took on a somewhat different character than it had with colleagues or principals because the nature of the vulnerability was very different. Honesty played a larger role in teachers’ discussions of trust in their students because most had experienced incidents of having students lie or steal. Honesty was also an issue in interactions with parents when a parent believed a student’s account of an event over that of a teacher who had witnessed the event or when parents denied that they were aware of any changes at home that could account for a child’s sudden change in behavior. Competence was a significant factor in teachers’ trust in parents while reliability and openness were less frequently mentioned. See Table 5.1 for sample codings.

Each of these elements and how they play out in teachers willingness to trust principals, colleagues, and clients are discussed in more depth below. Six of the teachers interviewed were from schools where they expressed a high degree of trust in the principal. These schools were called Brookside and Pine Grove School. Six teachers were from schools where trust had been damaged. These schools were called Lincoln and Fremont Schools. Data from one pilot study interview were also included in the analysis.
Faculty Trust in the Principal

Faculty trust in the principal was based on what teachers felt they ought to be able to expect from a person who occupied that role. What teachers seemed to expect, above all, was a sense of benevolence or good will from their principal.

Benevolence. The most frequently mentioned dimension of trust in the principal surrounded issues of benevolence or supportiveness. Previous research has linked trust in the principal with supportive leadership (Hoy, Tarter, & Witkoskie, 1992; Tarter, Bliss, & Hoy, 1989; Tarter, Sabo, & Hoy, 1995). Those teachers who expressed trust in their principal told stories of ways they had felt supported by the him or her. Those who did not trust their principal told of incidences where they expected support and it was not forthcoming. Some had experienced incidents of ill will or were aware of other teachers whom they felt had been treated unfairly or maliciously.

Brenda, the principal of Brookside School, one of the schools with a high level of trust, was described this way by a teacher who had taught in her building for a decade.

I think her underlying motivation is to help you be the best that you can be at what you are doing. And her underlying desire for you is nothing but good....She is always looking for ways to build you up, to let you know what your strengths are, and then areas she sees maybe you need to work on-- then giving you ways to work on those or see how others do it. She expects a lot but she gives a lot.

A younger teacher in the same building echoed similar sentiments.

Even though sometimes she gets mad and yells at us, we take our lickings and we go on. Yet, when we have a problem and we ask her for assistance she is right there to give it to us.

Because of the support these teachers received from their principal they were willing to accept correction from her and to meet the high expectations she had for them. In addition,
a simple expression of appreciation went a long way toward building satisfaction and commitment among the faculty in Brenda’s building. A third teacher at Brookside described what even small expressions of gratitude meant to her.

Her expectations are very, very high. We spend a lot of hours after school, on weekends; we do work a lot more than some other schools.... However, she is always very appreciative. The next day there is always a comment in the bulletin saying “Thank you those of you (listing them by name) who attended the program last night.” Even though we are in a very thankless job oftentimes-- parents don’t really say thank you, or kids don’t come up and say “Thank you for teaching me!” But she at least does it. And for me, that’s all I need. I just need a little bit of acknowledgment.

Many of the breaches of trust reported from principals centered on the failure to give support or to make a convincing show of good will. The effects of broken trust were multiplied when the teachers turned to each other for support, recounting the details of an infraction or an incident where a teacher did not receive support, so that trust was also broken with all who listened empathetically and worried that they might be a victim of the same kind of treatment. Burt and Knez (1996) hypothesized that social networks would serve to drive trust relationships toward extremes, enhancing strong trust relationships and compounding the effects of broken trust. These dynamics seemed evident in schools.

Reliability. The sense that one is able to depend on another is an element of trust. Although it was not mentioned explicitly as often as some of the other dimensions, being able to count on the principal was important. This dependability and high level of commitment were apparently contagious.

Brenda is a very hard worker. She works night and day. She is here every morning at 6:30 and she doesn’t go home until things are done. She may be here until 8 or 9 o’clock in the evening if there are meetings. And seeing her do that-- I guess she hires people who are hard workers. So the school gives 110 percent, everybody works hard here.
Teachers at both high and low trust schools reported that their principals were being pulled away from the school building for many district level meetings; however, the reactions to this were very different. At Lincoln, a low trust school, although teachers found interactions with the principal distasteful, there was nonetheless resentment that she was out of the building as much as she was. There was suspicion that the district level meetings did not really exist. Teachers lacked confidence that matters that fell outside of their jurisdiction or expertise would be handled adequately. At Brookside School, on the other hand, there was confidence that the principal was committed to the well being of the school and that she was doing her utmost for the school. The increased number of district level meetings were seen as an additional burden the district was putting on the principal to the detriment of the school, rather than as an opportunity for the principal to shirk her duties. In a trusting environment the benefit of doubt is extended and trust is reinforced, while in an atmosphere of distrust a similar set of external circumstances can serve to diminish a weak level of trust even further.

**Competence.** Although the subordinates in earlier studies did not emphasize the competence of their superiors as salient in their calculations of trust, the teachers in this study often mentioned incidents in which the competence of their principal mattered. Teachers felt vulnerable either to the competence or incompetence of their principal's leadership. All three teachers at Fremont School expressed their frustration at their principal's inability to make important decisions or to hold teachers accountable for standards of conduct. This account was typical.
But what bothers staff members is that they will identify a problem, like test scores at a certain grade level, and he'll say "I won't tolerate this, I'm going to deal with this." And nothing is ever done. Just so no waves are created. Or if it is somebody who is abusing sick time, who has no sick time but just never comes, it's "You know, it's only a matter of time and they will be gone." But it still continues and nothing happens. It's very hard for him to make an executive decision. He'll say "What do you think?" or "What do we want to do as a staff?" And that's fine as far as shared decision making, but if it concerns a really important issue I think he needs to make the decision. It's like, we have teachers who are late every single day... it's very flagrant with some staff members and he needs to put his foot down and say, "We expect you to be here at 8:30 and I expect you to stay until 3:40. And that's the way it's going to be." But he won't. He doesn't do that.

A failure to follow through with threats can be as damaging to trust as the breaking of a positive promise (Lindskold & Bennett, 1973). A novice teacher at Fremont was put in a difficult position when he attempted to fill the gap left by the principal's unwillingness to take action.

We have people coming in late, that's something that should be dealt with. And it's not; he's not enforcing his rules. I spoke up in one of our meetings so then I was laughed at. They said "Oh now we have to stay late because of you."

Although many of the teachers in the low trust schools acknowledged that their principals were either tired or frustrated and with good reason, they nonetheless were disappointed by the lack of leadership and the consequences this deficit had for them as teachers.

In the high trust schools, there was a very different sense of the principals' competence. The principals were regarded with respect and even admiration. While in one low trust school a teacher reported the principal's unsuccessful attempt to exercise leadership in the area of curriculum, in the high trust schools the principals not only set a high standard they also held teachers accountable in ways that seemed fair and reasonable to their staffs. At Brookside School the faculty were confident that their principal was on top of things.
Brenda is just very aware of everything in the building. She reads every report card, every conference report. She does recess duty every day, every recess, herself with aides, because she wants to be there when the problems happen and stop them. She doesn't want the problems to keep going. She wants to stop them from the minute they start. She is very much an integral part of the school. She is the school.

This level of involvement gave the faculty a sense of confidence that the school was being managed effectively, despite the inevitable difficulties inherent in an urban setting, and that problems would not be allowed to get out of hand. At Pine Grove, another high trust school, the faculty repeatedly described the atmosphere of the school as being very "professional." They said that began with the principal and was carried on throughout the faculty. In this school, the word "professional" seemed to signal a high standard of behavior that was expected of teachers— a challenge they were proud to meet.

Honesty. Baier (1986) observed that trust is most evident when it is damaged. Honesty was not mentioned except in instances where it was broken. At Lincoln School there was resentment that the principal had given negative assessments of teaching performance to teachers she wanted to replace with teachers of her own choosing, even though she had previously been complimentary of these same teachers. The pretense of an open hiring process to fill openings was also suspect when there were indications that she already had in mind the replacement she wanted to hire. Teachers wanted reassurance that their principal would be fair and accurate in their evaluations and not use these manipulatively. They also wanted to be sure that fair procedures were followed.

Openness. Previous studies of trust in organizations across hierarchical lines have proposed that openness would be important for subordinates to develop trust in their superiors because the withholding of important information might be one way that superiors
used to maintain power or manipulate employees (Gabarro, 1978; Kramer, 1996; Mishra, 1996). At Lincoln School the principal’s lack of engagement with the rest of the faculty was a source of distrust.

I see [us] like the worker bees and the Queen. The Queen stays in her hive, or in her office in this case. And everyone else is on the front line out here, we are working and getting the job done to the best of our ability.... It is almost like two different worlds. And the only time they cross is, maybe a discipline issue. It's almost like an island down there. We're out here working, you know, fighting the war and there's no support.

At Fremont School, even though teachers were frustrated with the principal’s failure to hold teachers accountable or to follow through on threats, they did appreciate his openness with information.

From the administrator, he keeps everybody informed of what's happening down at Central Office. And communiques that he gets or any directives, or any notices, he always xeroxs and puts them in everybody's mailbox, which is nice. Not very many administrators do that.

Although each of the elements of trust played a role in teacher’s trust in their principal, some mattered more than others. Above all teachers wanted to feel a sense of confidence in the benevolence or good will of their principals, but they also wanted to have them exercise leadership and hold teachers accountable to their duty to the students. At Brookside and Pine Grove Schools, both high trust schools, the faculty had confidence that they would be supported by the principal but also that problems would be handled effectively. At Fremont School although teachers felt a level of support and appreciated the openness of the principal, trust was undermined by a lack of leadership in holding teachers accountable and by threats that were never carried out. At Lincoln School a pervasive cycle
of distrust had set in, making the faculty suspicious of the principal’s motives for almost any action.

Teachers’ relationships with their colleagues had a different flavor. Rather than crossing hierarchical levels, relationships with other teachers were seen as more informal and almost voluntary. The next section examines the sources of trust in the relationships teachers have with each other.

Faculty Trust in Colleagues

Whether or not teachers trust one another can have a significant impact on the climate and effectiveness of a school. Previous research has linked teacher behavior to the creation of a sense of trust in colleagues. The collegiality of teacher relationships (Hoy, Tarter, & Witkoskie, 1992; Tarter, Sabo, & Hoy, 1995) as well as the authenticity of teacher behavior (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998) have been linked to faculty trust in colleagues. The extent to which teachers were engaged in the life of the school has also been linked to trust in fellow teachers (Tarter, Bliss, & Hoy, 1989). How these behaviors relate to the various dimensions of trust identified in this study has not been explored.

One complicating factor in understanding teacher trust in other teachers is that teachers seemed to hold two distinct trust judgments of their colleagues simultaneously. Chapter Two described the attempts of researchers to cope with the complexity of trust by naming different kinds of trust, e.g. “contractual trust” as opposed to “good will trust,” etc. The question was raised as to whether there was one trust or many trusts. The answer for teachers in schools seemed to be that there were two trusts: professional trust and personal trust. There were two different sets of expectations of what they owed to one another, either
as professional colleagues and as fellow human beings. When asked a question about the general level of trust among the faculty, several teachers spontaneously drew the distinction between professional and personal trust. One teacher at Fremont School, a low trust school, described the distinction this way:

I think there are two different levels. The professional that deals with any issues or concerns at the school level. I think there is a high level of trust here because everybody values each other’s opinions. I think there is another level that surfaces among faculty and I think that deals with the interpersonal relationships that teachers have that have nothing to do with the school per se. There may be outside influences like church, or it may be sororities that they once belonged to, or they may have taught together for a long time. That level of trust can sometimes create a barrier. There’s a lot of gossip that will go around which is not really professional gossip, it may be personal gossip. That kind of creates mistrust.

In this teacher’s view, a high level of personal trust among subgroups of the faculty impaired the development of an overall sense of trust among the faculty. This teacher reported that he did not feel that judgments about whether colleagues were doing a good job in the classroom entered into his calculation of professional trust because he did not feel that their classroom performance had an impact on him professionally. In this case, teacher’s engaged behavior did not relate to his level of trust in colleagues, but their collegiality was important. A teacher at Lincoln School also made the distinction between professional and personal trust but reported he held higher personal trust than professional trust.

Personally, I would trust any faculty member here. With anything, whether it be taking my car, house sitting, anything. Anyone here I would trust. As far as the professional aspect, some people I feel don’t live up to their end of the deal. In past years I have been in the upper grades, and I saw children who came to me who were not prepared. I have a feeling it is due to some of the professional qualities of some of the people I work with. I don’t hold that against them personally, but I feel that there could be a little more dedication professionally among the staff members. If I was giving them numbers, my professional trust would be maybe 70 or 80 percent, and my personal trust would be 99 percent.
Trust is based on expectations. The distinction these teachers have made between professional and personal trust suggests that there are two different sets of expectation that teachers feel they owe one another. What they owed to one another as role occupants and what they owed to one another as people were not necessarily the same. Although there was overlap, these two kinds of trust seemed to be somewhat independent from each other.

Benevolence. Benevolence was the single most often mentioned dimension of faculty trust in their colleagues. Benevolence in the form of support or caring was evident at both the personal and professional levels. At Lincoln School one young teacher described how welcome the other teachers had made her feel, while at Fremont a novice teacher reported that he had to work hard to win acceptance by the group, possibly, he speculated, because he was a male. Brookside teachers exhibited a particular pride in the ways the faculty looked out for one another.

I know there are people who have gone through divorces and the staff has known about that and they have helped and dealt with that. We have collected money during Christmas time to give to people because they are struggling a little bit financially. We have a staff member who was diagnosed with cancer and every Monday they would take dinner over to the family. When a staff has basically used all of her sick leave we have donated our sick leave so that she could continue to stay out. I think we are very caring. Whenever there is a tragedy that has happened in someone's life and we know about that then we respond. As well as exciting events like pregnancies, and marriages-- we buy gifts and go and attend. They genuinely like each other.

One young teacher at Brookside warmly related the ways she had experienced caring from other teachers.

My very first year one of the fourth grade teachers ...she was constantly giving me things, saying "Here, here's an idea." She did my first three days of lesson plans for me. She said "Here, here's an outline for you. If you like it use it, if you don't, don't." Just because she knew that I was going to struggle. Like those flowers (pointing to a vase on her desk), she just sent flowers around the building to brighten everybody's
day. Just because. Just because she wants people to feel good. That's her way of keeping everybody smiling. We take each other's kids a lot. ... Nobody ever says no. The day I had to do that I gave everybody candy bars in appreciation. But they said "You didn't have to do that, that is just the Brookside way."

Another teacher at Brookside echoed the ways that veteran faculty welcomed and looked out for new teachers, even when they came in with previous teaching experience.

And when you are new to the building the staff, they help new people coming in by-- when an extra expectation is due, they might help you. So they might say. "You know what, you are new. I'm going to take your class for an hour and why don't you work on your writing portfolios." Or "You are new to third grade this year, so why don't I write up your writing portfolios for you, and you won't have to worry about that, that will be finished..." Just because they know that the first year you have a lot of extra training and that is all on your own personal time-- and it is a lot.... The principal doesn't say "Go and do this." They just do it on their own. It is a wonderful working environment. It balances out the hard work.

Although in all of the schools some level of support or caring was reported among the faculty for one another, in schools where the trust was lower it was more fractionalized or confined to certain groups or cliques. For example, at Fremont School one of the teachers reported that one of cliques within the school made a big deal of celebrating one another's birthdays, with catered lunches, cake, and balloons. However, all of the teachers in this clique were black; no white teachers were invited to attend. The black principal's attendance at these affairs seemed to signal an acceptance of these divisions.

**Reliability.** Reliability was the second most significant dimension of teachers' trust in their colleagues. Teachers were about three times more likely to talk positively about the ways that they could depend on other teachers to live up to their commitments or to take their responsibilities seriously than in ways that they couldn't. A teacher at Brookside reported his confidence in his colleagues' dependability.
I can't recall where someone was suppose to have done something and didn't. Off the top of my head, I just can't recall it. I think there is a high degree of professionalism here, and they are committed to what it is they are doing. And when they say something I think they have every intention of following through with that. What I have seen is where others kind of pick up where the other person should have been. Other people fill in. But usually when people have made the commitment to do something they follow through with it.

At Fremont School teachers described their sense of responsibility to one another when emergencies arose.

There is a high level of trust that people will be here unless they are dead on their feet or seriously ill. They won't abandon their room or stick somebody else with it. If one person has to leave, if their son or daughter is ill, teachers will automatically take over their children or watch their children if emergencies arise.

However, another teacher at Fremont School complained that teachers did not always live up to their joint obligations to the students.

One of the things we have problems with, this sounds real simple, it's not anything real academic, but it's with the playground-- being on-time, covering the duties, being on-time to pick up your children outside. Because if you can't trust somebody to be out there with you, you have a lot of children to worry about. It's not putting the children first.

This teacher was put in the difficult position of having to supervise the playground alone when colleagues failed to show up to do their duties. At Lincoln School a teacher also expressed disappointment that her colleagues did not reliably meet their obligations to the children. It seemed that when trust decayed teachers more readily cut corners on their duty to children than their duty to other teachers. Perhaps it was easy for a teacher to imagine needing a favor reciprocated from another teacher, while the negative consequences of failing in one's duty to children may have been less obvious.
Competence. Most teachers did not feel that other teachers’ competence was a significant factor in deciding whether or not they could trust a fellow teacher. In terms of trust on a personal level the issues were not related. Even on a professional level, some teachers believed that their interdependence with other teachers centered on issues of reliability in facilitating the processes that kept the school running smoothly and not on others’ skill in the classroom. As was noted in Chapter Two, where there is no vulnerability, trust is not an issue.

I have seen a lot of circumstances with teachers who a lot of people felt were incompetent or really shouldn’t have been teaching. And I think the trust was there but I don’t think we as educators took that trust to mean are we trusting them because they are competent or not competent. We’re trusting them because they do help the smooth running of the school. But to me competency and incompetency, that’s another issue. I don’t see it as a trust factor. Now if we were teaming, that would affect me. But we are so isolated right now that it doesn’t affect me.

This teacher acknowledged that if he felt dependent on another teacher’s skill, if it affected him because of a situation of interdependence, then a colleague’s professional competence might be of concern. However, he did not perceive that level of interdependence. Some teachers did perceive interdependence though, and did feel that their colleague’s competence or perceived competence mattered. One teacher said that he did not trust one of his colleagues, in part because of the disrespectful tone toward her students he overheard from her as he passed her classroom in the hall.

One first grade teacher at Fremont school speculated that the second grade teachers might not trust her competence because of different teaching philosophies and because they took a different view of assessment.
That’s another thing we’re supposed to be doing—portfolios are supposed to be the ultimate assessment of the children. My children are assessed a certain way, and then they go up to the next grade and its “sit on your bottom” kind of stuff. Then they are assessed in a totally different manner. To some of the teachers that they go into it looks like they haven’t learned anything. They start them out on grade level material, but they have to understand that they came here at a much lower level.

Even in schools with an overall higher level of trust, differences in teaching philosophy created some tensions that made professional trust and collaboration more difficult. On one team the philosophical differences also fell down along racial lines, making the situation even more delicate. These teachers were in the process of taking their first tentative steps toward teaming in one or two subject areas to see how it might go. As they become increasingly interdependent on one another’s classroom skills, trust in one another’s competence is almost certain to become a more salient part of their trust in colleagues.

Honesty. For the most part people seemed to be able to take for granted the honesty or integrity of their colleagues. Honesty did not often come up as an issue of concern. In one school trust was broken when one teacher lied about another teacher in a report made to the principal. In another there had been a problem for a time with people finding things missing—portions of their lunches from the refrigerator, money from wallets, items from their classrooms. Teachers suspected it was the librarian who was stealing these items. They speculated that she must have gotten caught because she took a personal leave and didn’t return. After she left, items stopped disappearing. The situation was handled discretely, but the fact that it was dealt with seemed to help restore a sense of trust among the faculty.
Openness. Teachers talked about two kinds of openness, an openness with teaching ideas and strategies (professional openness) and an openness in sharing personal information (personal openness).

When you trust other teachers and you know they trust you, you feel comfortable about going to the job site. You want to have that sense of belonging. And you want others to belong. It makes you feel good about working in the situation—any situation. Just knowing that you’re missed when you’re not here. And things are personalized, where they ask about things and you don’t feel like they are dipping into your business. You are just happy to talk about it. We go to each other for advice on a lesson or if we need resources. We’re not afraid to ask other teachers. We’ll even go observe other teachers during our specials. So we can see what techniques they’re using that I can learn. There’s an openness. The teachers don’t look at you like “Why are you walking in my room?” We can just walk in each other’s room freely and if there is something I want I can just take it, and they can do the same—like the overhead projector or whatever. There is just that sense of trust that it won’t be abused, and it will be returned.

The amount of openness varied from school to school. At Brookside School there was an openness to sharing of ideas.

All the time, we might say “Oh what’s that I see you hanging outside? That’s really neat, can we do it? Or do you have extra copies? How did that work?” Or even if you don’t see something you might just go over and say, “I tried this today and the kids really liked it, you might want to try it with your class.” If something worked and your children really gained from it why wouldn’t you want as many children as possible to gain from that? I think everyone kind of thinks that way.

At Lincoln School when the sharing of ideas was not reciprocated it led to resentment.

There is a teacher who is leaving her position because the other teachers that she works with always look to her to do the work—to do the planning and finding resources. And then when she doesn’t do it for them, they get upset. And then when she shares, she expects them to share, and they never share with her.

The level of personal openness also varied considerably between schools. While teachers in high trust schools acknowledged that word was likely to spread through a
grapevine, there was a sense of confidence that whatever information people received about
one another would be handled with care. For example, a teacher at Brookside said:

There is a grapevine here, don't get me wrong, but I don't think it is a negative or
uncaring grapevine. Because once people find out about that from that grapevine,
they will respond in a positive manner. So people are willing to share.

In the low trust schools people were much more guarded in their willingness to share
information about their lives outside of school. A Fremont teacher said:

The gossip runs rampant very fast. And the best thing I have done, if I have a bit of
news that's concerning me or somebody else, I keep it to myself. I don't tell anybody.
If I have a problem with me, I keep it to myself. Because if you tell just one person,
they'll all know. It's like playing telephone, where you tell one person, and it gets
totally distorted by the time it gets around.

This lack of openness was linked to a concern about the level of benevolence or good will
this teacher could count on from his peers. Without the confidence that others would respond
in a caring manner there was a reluctance to make oneself vulnerable through the sharing of
information about things close to one's heart, about one's family and friends.

Each of the five elements of trust did play a role in the amount of trust that teachers
had in their colleagues. Some were more important than others. The most frequently
mentioned dimension was the level of benevolence or good will one could expect from one's
colleagues. This was experienced as support both on a personal and a professional level. The
level of openness seemed to be linked to the expected level of concern. Reliability,
competence, and honesty seemed to play a less central role in faculty trust in their peers.

The consequences of low trust. A low level of trust with colleagues can interfere with
the developing sense of competence of a new teacher. A teacher in the spring of his third year
of teaching reflected on the toll the low level of trust and the lack of support in his building
had taken. Not only was he disappointed in the kind of teacher he was becoming, he also felt his principles slipping.

The kids leave at 3:15. We're supposed to be here until 3:45. I'll find myself leaving at 3:30 sometimes because, it's like, "Why should I stay here? No one else is here." So I find myself-- that my moral obligation is less because no one else is doing it. I can say I'm staying because that's the rule. I can have that moral fiber, and I still think I do, but then I also think "What good is it going to do me to sit here for 15 more minutes when I could go do something else?"

As a new teacher that kind of lack of accountability, lack of guidance, it hurts. I'm not supported. I need to have an experienced teacher say "Have you tried this?" I've learned to shoot from the hip, and that's sad. Some of the stuff that has already been done, you don't realize it. You think you're doing something great and then someone says "Oh, that's been done." And you're, like, "Well, thank you!"

And I find myself to a point where-- I was always hoping I wouldn't be a teacher that would raise my voice and yell at a child. But I have yelled and I feel sick. I'm the kind of teacher, I want to make it real for the kids. And I'm still trying to learn to do that. And I swear, that if I didn't have to fight discipline all the time I don't know what kind teacher I would be, but I think I would be a fantastic one.

As if to punctuate his point, as we left the school a little more than an hour after school was out, on a Thursday afternoon in March, the teacher's and the researcher's cars were the only two left in the parking lot. If this story is typical, one has to be concerned about the lasting consequences of beginning teachers starting their careers in low trust schools. This young teacher was impressive in his enthusiasm and desire to engage his students. Indeed, he might have been a fantastic teacher had he started his career in a setting that had offered more support and guidance, not to mention better role models. It is disheartening that this young man, who had expressed such a strong sense of commitment and caring for the low income children he taught and who had so much to give, would probably never reach that potential.
Faculty Trust in Clients

Although faculty trust in students was mediated by a recognition that they were children and still in a stage of learning how to get along in the world, this also led to a blurring of the lines between trust in students and trust in parents. Several teachers asserted that when a child misbehaved it was not the child they mistrusted but the parents of that child.

At this age level I feel that if the child is not trustworthy it is as a result of the parents. And the responsibility isn’t really on them at this young age. I tend to get angry with the parents and lose trust with the parents. I don’t think I ever lose trust with the child. I get very angry with the parents.

Reciprocally, when a child was seen as trustworthy, the trust engendered was extended through the child to the parents.

This just may be a quirk of mine, but I have a great deal of respect for those parents of the students who have earned my trust. Because those qualities are coming from somewhere, and I say those qualities are coming from home. That’s what I say.

Because of the blurring of this distinction, trust in students and trust in parents are merged into one analysis that has been labeled trust in clients.

**Benevolence, reliability, and respect.** In making judgments about trust in parents, teachers often mentioned wanting to see a commitment to the child’s well being and to their education. They also were looking for respect extended to them as teachers.

I usually trust parents if they are sincere about their child’s education. If they come into the building and they don’t pose a threat--where they’re wanting to look for the negative. When they give you some positive hints or comments, or some positive body language, that makes me feel comfortable. To me that’s very important because the better the lines of communication, the better it is for the child. If the child sees that you don’t pose threat to their parents and they don’t pose a threat to you, the child fits into that link and then they can feel more confident to come in and share even personal matters.
When teachers did not have confidence that the parents of their students had the child’s best interests at heart, they were angry.

I have one little girl that her parents for some reason play games and don’t give her her medication in the morning, but as soon as she takes her pill at 11:00 she is fine. She is terrible in the morning. She gets so frustrated. She spits, she throws things, she slaps, she gets up, she screams, she leaves the room. And at times you get frustrated. But when you think about it you understand it is not entirely of her doing. And then my anger goes to the parents. It has been a long year with this particular family too. Not wanting to be called at home when the child misbehaves. Wanting the child identified as disabled, and when the child wasn’t identified they got up and stormed out of the room and left the meeting. I don’t know what they wanted-- personally I think they wanted money. I think they are using the child. The child was adopted, and I have my suspicions about why they adopted her.

When teachers felt like parents shared their commitment to what they felt was in the best interest of the child, they were willing to extend trust to the parents.

When it came to relationships with students, the dimension of benevolence or good will took on a somewhat narrower definition, most often characterized as respect. Because of the lower level in the hierarchy of schools occupied by students, the quality of vulnerability was quite different and so trust took on a different flavor. In making trust judgments about children, teachers were looking for students with internal control, children who not only exercised self-discipline but also were willing to cooperate with the system of school. The sense that a student was reliable grew from evidence of that self-discipline.

I am looking for respect. That is what I am looking for. If I see respect, if I see they just behave well, they just respect adults, they respect others, they know what school is about in terms of coming, paying attention, not goofing off, not punching or calling names, those are the kids I put my trust in. Those are kids who are usually reliable, dependable. They know what the system is and they are working within the system and they are not rebelling or trying to go against the system. I can count on them, and I can trust them. I can walk out that door and not worry about that child standing up all of a sudden and running across the room and popping somebody or throwing something, or not yelling out something inappropriate.
Parents and students who were rude and disrespectful, who blamed others for problems rather than accepting responsibility, were more difficult for teachers trust.

**Competence.** Competence in students had more to do with their conduct as students, a willingness to go along with the structures of school, than with academic competence. In making trust judgments about parents, competence played a larger role. Teachers recognized that some parents were at a loss to know how to discipline or care for their child.

Some are to the point that they don't know what else to do. They say “I tried this, I tried that.” (Laughingly) They feel my pain. And I'm sure in their own way they will do what they can.

When teachers felt their jobs were made more difficult because of the lack of competence of parents to provide for basic necessities and structure for their children, trust in parents tended to be lower.

**Openness.** Openness was also an element of a teacher's trust in students and in parents. Openness on the part of students was not usually mentioned as a problem, as one teacher commented 99.9% of the children were willing to talk about themselves if she just took the time to listen and showed an interest. One teacher talked about the importance of having time to get to know students in developing a relationship of trust.

[I look for their] opening up to me about where their personal life is concerned--what they did at home. Sometimes if a student doesn't share their personal experiences with you it may be that they are withdrawn or they may be intimidated by you as an adult. Usually a child just opens up. To me, that's the grounds for trust. Because I don't automatically trust a child when they come. I don't think every child is good or not good. It takes time to get to know them. I need background knowledge, and they need background knowledge from me. They need to know they can trust me.
One teacher recognized that she could facilitate openness on the part of students and of parents not just by showing interest, but also by being willing to share information about her own life as well.

I think early on it is just my personality to establish rapport with [the students] and with the parents as soon as I can. Talking to them often, letting them tell their stories. I have a sharing time every day, so they can say what is on their minds and they are not interrupting at other times. And if they have a story that relates to my life then I will share about myself and they just love to hear that....Any time [the parents] come in for any reason I try to take the time to talk with them, try to pull information about their lives, what kinds of jobs they have, what kinds of things they do with their children. When I tell them about myself then I think they feel more comfortable with me. I remind them that I have children because then they say “Oh, you do understand!” I think that really helps.

A willingness to communicate with the teacher enhanced the sense of trust. When a parent was willing to extend trust to the teacher, it was often reciprocated with trust in the parent. When parents discounted what teachers said, taking their child's side of a story only and blamed the teacher or other students for the child's misbehavior, distrust was fostered.

Most teachers wanted to have a partnership with parents, but they acknowledged that they did not usually initiate contact with parents unless there was problem with the student. One teacher talked about a program at her school of sending out postcards to parents when the child had done something well. She hadn’t seen any immediate results from this program, but she could imagine how pleased she would have been to get such a postcard and so was willing to do it occasionally for that reason. This program was a way to increase the number of positive contacts with parents.

Honesty. Honesty was a much bigger issue in relationship with students than it was in relationships with principals and colleagues because it had much more frequently been
violated. Many of the teachers reported that they regularly dealt with problems of students lying or not taking responsibility for their actions. Many reported having students who not only would steal from other students but who also had stolen from them.

Most of them I do [trust]. There's a couple I can't and I don't. A couple of them will go right up and go through the drawers of my desk and take whatever they want. But both of those I am thinking about take medication (for Attention Deficit Disorder). It's easier knowing it is the medication. Maybe if they weren't on medication I would be a little less forgiving.

On the whole they were more forgiving of this behavior than they might have been from an adult because they acknowledged that they were still just children and that they were learning.

Most of the teachers evidenced a genuine fondness and caring for their students, even if they were frustrated by the amount of time and energy they had to devote to disciplining them. In establishing trust relationships with students, above all they were looking for respect and reliability. For many there was more leeway in their definition of trust with students because the expectation they had for them as children was different than what they expected from other adults or colleagues. In developing trust with parents, teachers above all wanted to see that there was a commitment to the child's well being and education. When teachers invested themselves in their students, they wanted to feel that caring was acknowledged and shared by parents. They wanted to feel there was a unity of purpose.

Conclusion

Different elements or dimensions of trust played a differential role across organizational levels. Benevolence, or a sense of good will or respect was the most important determinant of trust. Competence was important only if it influenced some level of perceived
interdependence, some aspect of vulnerability. Reliability or dependability again only mattered when it affected some level of interdependence. Honesty was assumed unless it had been broken. Openness was an important condition of trust in that it provided the opportunity to demonstrate benevolence and also to signal a willingness to be vulnerable or to trust the other. Overall, the five-dimensional model of trust was confirmed by the findings of this phase of the study, though the dimensions varied in importance.

Dynamics of Trust

One of the things that makes trust difficult to study is that it is a dynamic process. Trust builds slowly over a period of time. The nature of a trusting relationship can be changed in an instant in an overheard remark or a malicious act. Once it is damaged, trust can be difficult to repair. Broken trust can lead to a self-perpetuating cycle of distrust.

Betrayal, Revenge and Repair

Research reported in Chapter Two suggested that there are two broad categories of trust violations within organizations: a damaged sense of civic order or a damaged identity (Bies & Tripp, 1996). The trust violations that resulted in a damaged sense of civic order had to do with a breach of rules or norms governing behavior and what people owed to one another in a working relationship. Trust violations that resulted in a damaged identity included public criticism, wrong or unfair accusations, or insults to one’s self or the collective of which one was a part.

Breaches that resulted in a loss of trust have been significantly related to employee’s performance and to intentions to leave the employer (Robinson, 1996). When there was high initial trust between an employee and an employer, the employee’s reactions to a perceived
breach were much less severe; however, when the initial trust was low, the breach was much more likely to result in poor employee performance and the desire to leave the organization. These dynamics were evident in the schools in this study.

**Betrayal by the principal.** Trust in the principal at Lincoln School was very low. Teachers reported breaches of both kinds--both breaches in what they felt was owed to them and to their colleagues, as well as assaults on their identities as professionals and as people. The third-party gossip served to broaden the negative impact of these incidents beyond the teachers involved and drive down trust among the whole faculty.

One example of an assault on teachers' identities came after a group of teachers had worked to put together a technology plan for the school to take advantage of a state-wide program being offered to the schools. These teachers had worked hard, giving up time after school and during their spring break, to write the proposal; however, none of them had any experience or special training in these matters. The principal was a member of the committee, but she rarely came to meetings or offered any assistance. Despite all their efforts the plan was rejected. When one of the teachers who had served on the committee arrived early to a faculty meeting, he overheard the principal talking to a district official about the plan's rejection. The principal's harsh remarks about the committee left the teacher feeling hurt and unappreciated, especially because the principal had not carried her weight as a member of the committee.

Trust was further damaged with this principal when she tried to get rid of three teachers who were well-liked and respected by the rest of the faculty in order to bring in staff members of her own choosing. Because other teachers identified with the victims, distrust
spread to others. The first incident involving the removal of a teacher began when the principal challenged a teacher about her use of sick days on Fridays and Mondays. The teacher countered that she had used these days to take her young daughter to the doctor and that she had not gone beyond the number of sick days allotted. The teacher contacted the union representative in the building and asked her to be a part of any subsequent meetings on the subject. The principal responded by initiating an aggressive schedule of observation and evaluation of the teacher. Other teachers were angered by what they saw as the unfair treatment of this young teacher and worried that they could become victims of the same treatment if they were to challenge the principal.

Because we just felt like after the first observation and evaluation that our principal was on a mission to get rid of her, and nothing she would have done—she even asked to be placed back in the PAR program and she was turned down for that. So there was nothing she could do. When [the principal] was telling her that she didn't have control of her classroom, she was asking "Well what can I do? You are supposed to be giving me support. Give me advice, what can I do?" But none was offered. So we knew right then and there that she wanted her out.... I feel [the principal] has always been nice to me, but then she was to the other teacher also. So you never know.

Another action taken by this principal that was perceived as a tactic to remove a popular teacher in order to fill a position with a teacher the principal preferred was to give the teacher an unfavorable class assignment.

We had another instance where, at the beginning of the year...we had a staff reduction. We had an opening in second grade and we had in opening in a 4/5 split. So the next thing we know we had a staff meeting and she came in and she told us about the staff reduction, then the next thing we know she goes “Mrs. Johnson, you’ll be teaching the four-five split, and Mr. Stewart, (who had been teaching fifth grade for five years!) you will be teaching second grade. Thank you, that’s the end of our meeting. Goodbye.” She turned around and walked away. Everyone turned and looked at him and asked “When did she tell you this?” He said, “This is the first I’ve heard it.” She hadn’t discussed it with him; she just announced it and that was that.
We just knew instantly that he was going to transfer out. Everyone felt that that’s what she wanted... But he didn’t, he said he wasn’t going to let her pull that one over on him. But he just feels betrayed because of what she did.

The third incident involved a teacher who had worked very hard and exercised a lot of leadership to get grants and special programs for the school. When this teacher finally got fed up because of the lack of cooperation and of appreciation, she started refusing special assignments. The principal responded by trying to move the teacher out of her position in order to bring in someone else she had in mind. The teacher felt doubly betrayed when the principal’s means of doing so was by calling into question the teacher’s competence.

I keep on getting things thrown in my mailbox. It is addressed to the principal and it will be thrown in my box—about grants to write, or a committee to chair. Now I just throw it back. So I finally wrote a note back and said "I do not want to chair this committee, but I will be happy to participate." And that was read at a staff meeting, that that’s what I had said, verbatim, to the principal. Verbatim.... I had said to certain staff members that it would either be on the bulletin or she would find a way to let the whole staff know that I declined. [After that] she told me I wasn’t strong enough in my position and that she wanted someone else.

Each of these instances violated what these teachers felt was owed to them by their principal. The instances occurred in an atmosphere of low trust and had an impact both on the teachers’ performance and desire to remain a part of the organization. Although these teachers still felt a commitment to the children of their school, and to work hard based on their own sense of professionalism, they reported less than full effort by many of their peers. Of the three teachers interviewed, two had put in requests to transfer to other schools and the third, a young teacher, expressed doubts about how long she would remain in the teaching profession. The consequences to the organization of the loss of trust were substantial.
Betrayal by colleagues. Betrayals are not limited to relationships with the principal in schools. Teachers also have expectations of what they owe one another as colleagues. When these expectations are not met, hurt feelings and anger are the result. Breaches both of a damaged social order or a damaged sense of identity were reported. One teacher described an incident of betrayal by another teacher that was a breach in the sense of civic order, the breaking of a confidence.

Since I was forced to be on a committee that I didn’t want to be on, I told [this teacher] that since I was interviewing [for other positions] there might be a conflict of time and I would expect that she could help me out since she was an alternate. So she went and told another staff member who is close to the principal that I was interviewing. And I walked in and heard her… she knew that that person would communicate with the principal. And then when I walked in, she walked out and didn’t make eye contact. And I called her on it too.

This teacher responded with a confrontation. She let the other teacher know that not only was she angry at her for sharing confidential information but that she expected an apology when she was caught, not a slinking away with eyes averted.

Another teacher reported an incident of a damaged sense of identity. He had agreed to do some task, but something came up and he had not yet been able to fulfill that commitment. A teacher he was close to told him that another teacher had said “Oh, he will always agree to do anything, but he doesn’t follow through.” He was stung by this criticism and didn’t feel that there was justification for turning this one lapse into a general statement. His response was not to confront the other teacher but to make sure that could never again be said of him. He is now careful in the commitments he agrees to and makes sure that he is above reproach when it comes to his performance of those commitments.
Betrayal by a parent. Teachers also had a sense of what they were owed by parents, and felt hurt or betrayed when parents did not meet those expectations. One teacher told of an incident where a parent complained to the principal about discipline problems in her classroom without discussing the issues with the teacher first.

I did have some trust issues with a couple of my parents this year at the beginning of the year. And that I have not forgotten....The first day of school I must have started out wrong because really that first month that was really hard on me and took a lot out of me. And discipline was a real issue for me. It was a very frustrating situation for me as an educator....So anyway, one of my parents came in at 2:00 and stayed in our class for the rest of the day. She had always been very supportive of me. Basically she knew the make up of the class and she admitted [that it was a very difficult group]. Well, she went to the principal later and said I didn’t have good discipline. It really hurt me that to my face she seemed all supportive, and then she is going to go and do that....But it is interesting as the course of the year has gone on then, of course, these parents have kind of changed their whole tune about it. “Oh, my child is reading better than he ever has.” ...But I still remember that because I don’t feel it was handled right. I would have preferred if they would have come to me instead of going behind my back and talking to the principal....Then I found out that before her son came to our building he used to get in trouble all the time for fighting. I’m thinking—“You are criticizing me for discipline and yet your child used to be a real discipline problem.”

In addition to having parents deal directly with them when problems arose, teachers also wanted parents to respect their expertise. Particularly when parents had a much lower educational level than the teacher, teachers were bothered when parents questioned their competence. When parents expressed confidence in the teacher’s sense of care for their child, teachers found it easier to establish an atmosphere of cooperation and mutual respect.

Revenge. When a person’s trust has been betrayed, he or she has to decide how to respond. Bies and Tripp (1996) reported a number of strategies people might use, from confrontation, to feuding, to withdrawing from social contact with the person they felt had wronged them. The teachers in this study reported a variety of responses. One teacher
described how a teacher in her school who had broken the confidence of a whole group of teachers felt their collective wrath.

There is one teacher who likes to talk about everyone in the building. But one teacher told her she needed to stop. And she came and told everyone what she had been saying. So then everyone stopped sharing with her because we found out what she had been saying about everyone. [She and I] started together last year, and I really confided to her, and come to find out she basically just repeated everything I had said. So we just snub her. When she tried to talk to people, they just basically turned away or changed the subject. So she got the message that she wasn’t welcome. I’m not a mean person; I still speak to her. But I will not tell her anything, and everyone in this building knows that.

Another breach of civic order involved the intentional distortion of facts in order to get a fellow teacher in trouble with the principal. This teacher had invited some classmates from the university to engage in a discussion with several faculty members at his school about the strengths and weaknesses of the professional development activities in the school. The principal was scheduled to be a part of the discussion, but at the last minute he was unable to attend. The day after the meeting this teacher was called into the principal’s office. The principal said that he had learned the tone of the meeting had been very negative toward him.

He said "I heard you all tore me apart yesterday." And I was sort of taken aback and I said "Mr. Davis, what do you mean?" And I said, "No, I have the session taped if you want to listen to the tape recording." That person (who made the call) was the main person who had [criticized him]! That was real hard to deal with. That’s the first time I ever had an administrator call me in his office and shut the door. And I’m thinking "I don’t know what I did wrong." But we’re good friends. We’ve known each other forever. I was very honest with him. When I started this position, we said to each, if something is bothering us we’ll talk about it because we have to work together.

Although the rift with the principal was repaired, this teacher still refused to speak to the colleague who had made the call even a year and half later.
I wouldn't speak to that person. I'm not usually like that. But I was so angry that I knew if I said anything to her ... but I think I've made my point. And everything that we do, I don't include that person.

This incident resulted in long term feuding and the holding of a grudge that lasted beyond a school year. This certainly had a detrimental impact on these teachers' ability to collaborate or work together.

**Repair**

Examples of broken trust were not limited to the low trust schools. Almost all of the teachers could give an example of when their trust had been broken either by the principal or by a colleague. The difference was that in the high trust schools, even if people had sometimes chosen to keep their feelings to themselves, time had healed those wounds and people were able to go on as friends. People gave one another the benefit of the doubt. There was social capital to spend.

At Brookside School, although the principal was highly respected, she had the reputation of occasionally being short-tempered with members of her staff. People were willing to overlook this short-coming and forgive her because of her overall dedication and level of support for them.

I think people are willing to go to bat for her because she will go to bat for them. When she may not be having a good day and it just seems that she is upset with you personally, people are willing to step back and say "This is not how she operates, this is not the norm." I am willing to step up and give her the benefit of the doubt that there is something external to me. And I have heard even when she has responded negatively, or approached someone in a negative situation, the person was able to go back to her and tell her that they didn't think it was right. She apologized, admitted her mistake, and everything was fine. A new teacher would maybe have a hard time understanding everything that is going on. But that's where other teachers come in and say "That happens sometimes, that's just her way." We all coach each other and with the new teachers we tell them "Don't worry, that's just the way she does. She'll be fine. She is not out to get you." There is that support there to let that person know.
Teachers in this school were willing to extend forgiveness when their principal was having a bad day and unnecessarily short tempered with a teacher. The rumor that this principal had been willing to apologize when confronted by a teacher built trust, even among teachers who had not been the recipient of such an apology themselves. As a consequence of the trust invested in this principal, new faculty members were coached not to take these outbursts personally and to let them go. This is an example of how cycle of trust builds even greater trust, and the involvement of third parties can strengthen the trust in a high trust environment (Burt & Knez, 1996). Incidents that might be interpreted as a breach of trust are neutralized by the overall sense of trust. The opposite also seemed evident. In schools where the trust was low, even fairly minor infractions, such as the failure to give personalized acknowledgments on Teacher Appreciation Day, contributed to the perpetuation of the cycle of distrust (Govier, 1992).

The high level of trust at Brookside created an environment where a broken trust with colleagues could also be repaired. A teacher whose feelings had been hurt let her colleagues know what was bothering her, with the expectation that her feelings would be taken seriously and that she would receive a caring response. She was willing to accept that the action had not been done with the intention of excluding her and so she was able to let her hurt feelings go.

There was one time this year where two of the fifth-grade teachers started rotating (students for certain subjects) with each other and I felt kind of excluded, I guess. And once my feelings were known we talked about it and got everybody’s feelings out in the open. And it wasn’t done intentionally at all. What they told me was that they had done it on a whim because they needed to do something at that time. And then they were supposedly trying it out to see if it would work among the fifth grade.
They are very good friends outside of school as well. So I think they were just talking and just did it. They didn’t realize that it had hurt me. When I told them how much it did we talked about it and de-briefed everything. We understood each other’s point of view and went on.

In the low trust schools, there were no reports of attempts to repair damaged trust. The wounds were still festering, sometimes more than a year later. Ongoing distrust was a drain on the energy, imagination, and vitality of Lincoln and Fremont schools. Faculty were less able to respond to the needs of their students. They were not places where people looked forward to coming to work each day.

**Trust and Organizational Processes**

Trust not only impacts the interpersonal relationships of people within organizations, its presence or absence impacts the functioning of the organization and can impact its effectiveness. The dynamics of trust in relationship to four organizational processes are explored below – collaboration, communication, organizational citizenship, and the proliferation of rules.

**Trust and Collaboration**

There is an interest in collaboration in schools growing out of the recognition that the problems facing the schools are too big and too complex to be solved by any individual or group of people working alone. Collaboration has been difficult to study because it is difficult to define. Having structures in place to facilitate participation in decision making has not proven to be useful as a definition. Teachers often perceive that they are being asked to participate in committee meetings but that the agenda and outcome have been set ahead of time. This could be called contrived or pseudo-collaboration. It grows out of a human relation philosophy that looks to participation to build acceptance by lower-level
organizational participants of decisions made by superiors (Bartunek & Keys, 1979; Conley, Schmiddle & Shedd, 1988; Creed & Miles, 1996). This type of participation has not produced very impressive results in terms of school effectiveness and change (Malen, Ogawa, & Kranz, 1990).

Another motivation for participation is the recognition that organizational participants in touch with the technical core, the teaching and learning processes in schools, on a daily basis have experiences and knowledge that are valuable for solving the problems that schools face (Bartunek & Keys, 1979; Conley, Schmiddle, & Shedd, 1988). Discerning the differences between these two meanings of participation has not been easy. Interviews with teachers can begin to specify the subtle difference in perception of teachers about the level and quality of collaboration in their schools.

The findings of this study confirmed that, in general, teachers appreciated being asked to participate in decisions about issues that affected them. This pleasure was likely to sour, however, when they perceived that the decisions had no real impact, that they were blamed when the decisions they made did not work out the way they had hoped, or that the principal was simply using faculty participation to abdicate responsibility for accountability within the school.

At Lincoln School, as was noted earlier, teachers who worked as part of a technology task force felt doubly betrayed when the principal not only did little to help the committee accomplish its goals; she was also was then overheard speaking negatively about the committee’s efforts to a district official. The teachers felt no appreciation for the time and effort they had put into researching a topic they had little experience with, or for the time
they had put in after hours to develop the proposal. There was the sense that had the proposal been funded, the principal would gladly have accepted credit for the process, but when it was rejected she blamed the committee members and failed to acknowledge her lack of leadership. The teacher who had served on that committee expressed reluctance to volunteer for any future committees.

At Fremont School the faculty appreciated the principal’s willingness to include them in decisions that affected the functioning of the school. However, they also saw the principal’s use of shared decision making as an excuse for him to abdicate responsibility or to avoid conflict.

If someone has a question he throws it back to them and says "Well, how do you think we should do this? What are your suggestions? " So it comes from them not from him.... Because we're the ones that set the decision so we have to carry it out. We're accountable for it because we made the suggestion.

On the other hand, this openness also allowed the principal to avoid some of the more unpleasant aspects of his job—holding resistant faculty members accountable to the agreed upon program of the school.

There are a lot of decisions they would like to see him make, that they don't really feel is a staff decision, it is an administrative decision. We have people here who have never bought into our program, and every year he says "You may want to consider transferring" but every year nothing happens. He needs to call them privately and say "I will do everything for you; but you are not buying into our program you need to leave." But he won't do it. And I think the staff would fall on their hands and knees and bow to him if he would do that. You cannot just be the facilitator—you have to be the leader.

Although not all decision making was relinquished to the faculty at Brookside school, the principal was able to include faculty members in decision making in a way that also maintained a sense of accountability to the mission and goals of the school.
She polls our opinions a lot. Sometimes she has made a few decisions on her own that we haven't always agreed with but for the most part she'll come to us and say "What do you think?" If we come to her and say we have this idea, we have to have a solution for it too. You can't just have an idea, you have to have a solution of how it will work-- then she will listen to you. She won't let you come to her with "Here's my idea" and then make her come up with a solution. But if you come with an idea and a plan for making it work then she is very open to it and she will think about it. Our input is very important to what happens... because we have to do it. We have to teach it, we have to implement it.

The faculty at Brookside wanted to change the physical layout of the classrooms in order for grade level teams to work more closely together and to share supplies. The principal, on the other hand, wanted to keep a mixture of grade levels near each other to support the program of having older students "buddy up" with younger students. When, after more than a year of discussion, the faculty came up with a compromise plan that could accommodate both sets of needs, the principal implemented the change.

One of the biggest obstacles to teachers collaborating with one another is the norm of autonomy that is strongly ingrained in the teaching profession (Conley, Schmiddle & Shedd, 1988; Lortie, 1975; Rosenholtz, 1985; Sarason, 1982). These dynamics were particularly pronounced at Lincoln and at Fremont, where the trust was lower. Reluctance to give up autonomy was cited as a reason for the difficulty of making collaboration work. In addition to a loss of autonomy, teachers were also reluctant to expose themselves to the scrutiny and possible criticism of their peers.

We talked about peer observation. We've even made a schedule where there would be peer coaching among the teams, and we would take over their class. But they wouldn't do it. We tried videotape. Boy, did they buck on that! Because they had to critique them after they watched them. Everybody is in their private domain and they want to protect that. We have an open door policy. The doors are not allowed to be shut in the building; anybody can come in. But once you try to set something up where people can observe another colleague, they are not very receptive to it.
One reason this teacher saw for this resistance was because a number of teachers liked to gain status by talking as though they were doing a lot of innovative things in their classrooms where in reality their teaching remained very traditional.

Teachers may not only not want to collaborate themselves, they may feel threatened when others in their schools begin to collaborate. They may communicate this discomfort through social sanctions, as one fourth grade teacher at Fremont learned to his dismay.

This fall another first grade teacher and I had our classes working together studying trees and fall leaves. And that was pretty cool, we were able to mix up both the primary and the intermediate. We took our classes out to some of the parks near here. And then they asked me bluntly-- was I having an affair with this teacher! They were joking, I think, but they were also half serious....That really upset me for awhile!

This teacher felt that his attempts to work with another teacher were not only noticed, but disapproved of by the other members of the faculty. He was put on notice that that kind of team work was not welcomed.

When trust was high and teachers felt affirmed by their principal they were much more willing to make themselves vulnerable through teamwork and sharing with other teachers. At Pine Grove School several teams of teachers had begun team teaching in order to incorporate children with disabilities into the regular classrooms. This innovative program had been going on for more than five years, and each year, it seemed, more teachers were willing to give it a try. Those who were involved felt it was very beneficial, although there were others on the faculty that remained resistant. At Brookside School the principal’s affirmation and acceptance of differences in teaching style helped created an atmosphere where teachers were willing to share with one another.
Our principal is very sensitive to everyone's differences. But then she plays on our strengths within our differences and she treats all of us equally. There is nobody who is put up on a pedestal at any time. That’s something that changes the whole atmosphere between the staff members because you never have that sense of competition. And if you need help in something you feel comfortable going to your co-workers and asking for help—or sharing what has worked for you or what hasn’t worked for you. And it is never an embarrassing situation. Brenda will point things out but she doesn’t do it in a way that makes anyone feel inferior. Because she always brings out that person’s strength. That person’s strength may not be your strength so you don’t take offense at it. But the next conversation you may be the person whose strengths she may be discussing. Every person feels valued.

Without a sense of competition or the need to protect one’s turf, these teachers were able to gain from one another’s expertise and ideas.

The spirit of collaboration at Brookside translated into classroom practice, not only in the frequent use of group work in class activities and a conscious step-by-step process for resolving interpersonal difficulties, but also in a program in which older students team up with younger students to read and do projects—the same kind of program the teachers at Fremont tried to implement and were teased about. The teachers at Brookside saw it as very beneficial not only for the younger students but for the older ones as well.

Buddies are very much an integral part of our curriculum too, doing cross-grade-level things. We have a class that we work with and we may write stories with them, we may do art projects with them, we may just write books with them. At the beginning of the year we read to them but by this time in the year they read to us. And my kids love it. They’ll say "Hey! This kid’s reading at such-and-such a level!" They’ll say "They’re a good reader, or they're a good writer!" So I guess that probably creates part of the sense of community too.

Teachers saw this program as helping older students polish their own skills as they used them to instruct the younger students. Students who had struggled themselves took pride in the accomplishments of their buddies and became more engaged learners themselves. The younger students benefitted from the one-on-one attention of an older friend. These positive
outcomes would not be possible if the teachers did not trust each other enough to collaborate on the planning and implementation of this program.

The spirit of teamwork and cooperation at Brookside and Pine Grove Schools did not just happen by accident. There was evidence of hard work and a conscious effort to making it happen. The dividends were clear. In these schools teachers, students, and parents all benefitted from the sense of community. At Fremont and Lincoln Schools, without the leadership to cultivate and maintain productive working relationships, the environment was strained and difficult for all the participants. Although the building of trust and collaborative processes in schools may require time, effort, and leadership the investment brings satisfying returns.

Trust and Communication

In schools where trust was high, communication flowed freely and teachers functioned as an early warning system, making the principal aware of problems while they were still small. Teachers in low trust schools described constrained communication networks. Where trust was low teachers avoided making contact with the principal, making it difficult for her or him to gain the information needed to be proactive. One teacher described how she had given up on communicating about her problems because nothing was done to resolve them. Although the complaints to the building council were suppose to be kept confidential, teachers would figure out who had made the complaint and act out their displeasure with that teacher. For example, this teacher noted that often the teacher who was suppose to share recess duty with her simply did not show up. She was left to supervise the
entire playground by herself. But she had decided that she would rather do her best to cope with the problem alone than communicate it to the principal or the building council.

At Lincoln School the teachers interviewed were careful to close their doors and to turn the intercom switch to the privacy setting before the interview began. When an announcement came in over the intercom in the midst of one of these interviews, the teacher looked startled and alarmed and it took her several moments to regain her composure sufficiently to continue. When asked about incidents of broken trust in the same school another teacher began “I’ll be vague about it.” When a third teacher escorted the interviewer out the back door of the school at the end of the interview, she looked around nervously to make sure that she was not being observed. Each wanted reassurance that their confidentiality would be protected. The principal in this school was described as inaccessible, and when interactions did occur the tone was often negative and unhelpful.

There is becoming a distinction between the workers and the managers. It is almost like the Wizard of OZ behind the drape, and you can't see, you can't talk to the Wizard. You know they are there but you can't communicate with them.

Teachers in both low trust schools described discipline that was reactive rather than proactive. They described very minimal involvement or communication with parents, and what communication existed, revolved mostly around problems of student behavior. One teacher described his attempts to work with the parent of a student who started the year as a model student but who came back from the winter break a changed child--hostile, unruly, and unkept. He said the mother had come to the first couple of conferences to address this problem but then stopped coming or even returning phone calls. There were very few social
encounters between teachers and parents. Even when events were planned, attendance was minimal.

In contrast, teachers in high trust schools described rich networks of communication. Teachers in one school described monthly social events sponsored by the PTA. Teachers just had to show up. In another the principal explored having each classroom wired for a telephone to facilitate communication with parents. When that proved unfeasible she purchased a portable telephone for each wing. In this school students were also expected to attend the quarterly conference between home and school. The student was the direct recipient of praise for whatever progress had been made, but the student was also the center of the problem-solving efforts around any difficulties. Parents were involved in an annual overnight at the school and in group-building and challenge activities that involved the faculty and students. Each of these points of contact build what researchers call social capital, an accumulation of good will that could then be “spent” to address problems.

**Trust and Organizational Citizenship**

Organizational citizenship has to do with instances when a worker spontaneously goes beyond the formally prescribed job requirements and performs non-mandatory behaviors without expectation of receiving explicit recognition or compensation (Organ, 1988; Deluga, 1994). In Chapter Two a study was reported that found when a leader articulated a clear vision, was able to foster an acceptance of group goals, and held high performance expectations, these behaviors were likely to lead to greater organizational citizenship of subordinates but *only if* the employees trusted the leader. When employees did
not trust the leader these behaviors did not lead to greater citizenship (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990).

Although the current study did not explicitly examine the leadership behavior of principals, it was evident that the level of organizational citizenship was lower in the schools where the principal was not trusted and was higher where there was trust in the leader and in colleagues. A causal link cannot be inferred— it cannot be determined whether lower trust caused poor organizational citizenship or whether the poor citizenship lead to lower trust. Most likely it was a reciprocal process where poor citizenship led to lower trust and lower trust led to poorer citizenship. One teacher at Lincoln School who felt deeply betrayed by her principal, nonetheless, recognized that the principal’s negative behavior was caused, at least in part, by frustration after three years of trying to get the teachers to try new things or do more than the minimum required of them.

I can understand her frustration, and I can deal with that. I have seen people show an interest and then turn around and not put in any effort on the follow through. I can’t take responsibility for all the people on the staff and their unwillingness to learn.

This principal had come to the school with ideas for improving the curriculum, but after three years was discouraged by the lack of progress that had been made.

At the low trust schools organizational citizenship was very low. Not only did these teachers report that many of their colleagues came late and left early, they also cut corners on planning and meeting with other teachers, and they did not extend themselves for each other the way the teachers in the high trust schools reported that they did. A teacher at Lincoln described her disappointment at the lack of willingness of her colleagues to share ideas or to try new things.
I would like to see more sharing going on—an openness that I don't think is quite there throughout the whole staff. If you throw out an idea, it's not like "Well, let's consider it. What are the strengths? What are the weaknesses?" It's not really analyzed. It's, like, "I just don't have the time." Too much time. I've always been someone who is willing to put in the time and so I feel kind of resentful. I have put in a lot of time and no one is willing to put forth the effort. That's across the board-- of adults. I think the children go above and beyond, but I think the adults don't.

It's not just that the teachers in these schools put forth the minimum required by their contract, they put in the minimum they could get away with. Teachers reported teaching assistants who spent their time in the office chatting with the secretaries, even during the 90 minute block of intensive academic time in the mornings or who refused to do recess duty even if they were assigned to do it. One told how an aide had eaten the snacks that had been prepared for students to eat during their break from standardized testing. One person even reported a veteran teacher at her school who watched soap operas every afternoon from 12:30 to 2:00 while the class was assigned seat work to do! While the teachers interviewed were distressed by this behavior among their colleagues, they didn't see that there was any significant effort being put forth to do anything about it.

Each of the teachers in the low trust schools struggled with how to maintain his or her own dedication and commitment in an atmosphere that did not support that effort. The poor citizenship and lack of respect led one second-year teacher to question her commitment to remaining in teaching.

That's why I'm in school now, because I can't see retiring as a teacher. I thought that we would have much more respect as teachers. I was expecting more respect from our principal and basically we get no respect. She gives more respect to the assistants that work in this building.... She gives them something to do and they won't do it. But let us say that, it's a whole 'nother story, you know.

Poor citizenship had led to disillusionment with the whole enterprise of teaching.
Many of the teachers in the low trust schools had either put in for transfers or felt they needed to give a rationalization of why they chose to stay. They spoke about liking the children and wanting to make things better for these low income students. One described how he would lay awake at night and try to think of ways he could make things better for his students or address the difficulties they were having. He talked about how he had purchased many sets of hats and mittens during the winter and how even students who were not in his class would come to him when the word got around. As much as these teachers cared for their students and the work they were doing, in the absence of a concerted effort by the entire faculty, there was a general sense of discouragement.

At the two high trust schools there was a very different story. Organizational citizenship was high, teachers were not only considerate of one another, they went far beyond the minimums required of them. A teacher at Brockside School described her and her colleagues’ reaction to her principal’s high expectations. This principal required that every teacher make at least one positive contact with every parent within the first two weeks of school.

We could say no, contractually we could say no. It's a pain, it takes time and work, and most of it you do from your home or you spend hours here at school. She expects it, she can't force us to do it because it's not contractual. Yet, we have such a high respect for her, and we want her backing when something goes wrong, so we do it. I mean, we fuss and groan and grumble about things, but most of the time if she says “Do this.” then we try to do our best.

Each of the three teachers interviewed in this school described ways that they willingly responded to requests to go beyond the minimum, from an annual Saturday planning retreat to extra programs at school. This principal had earned the trust of her faculty by being a
valuable resource in times of trouble. Whether teachers were struggling with the behavior of a particular student or with how to plan and present a particular curricular unit, the teachers reported that they could rely on their principal for help. In exchange, they were willing to work hard and give their best.

**Trust and the Proliferation of Rules**

Schools, like all organizations, must balance extending trust to employees with coping with the aftermath of broken trust. As trust deteriorates in an organization one likely response is the institution of more and more rules (Shapiro, 1987; Zucker, 1986). However, especially in an organization like a school, where workers are professionals and need a certain amount of discretion in order to do their jobs effectively, the proliferation of rules is likely to have dysfunctional consequences (Fox, 1974). In a study of a team of scientists, the institution of a strict set of rules was seen as threatening to the workers’ sense of professionalism, and led to hurt feelings and a sense of not being appreciated (Sitkin & Stickel, 1996). A similar outcome was found at Lincoln School where the principal had resorted to the institution of more and more rules to delimit teachers’ behavior.

[Last year] I was on the ABC (Association Building Council) committee. The staff and principal get together and talk about actual issues in the school. At the beginning of the year we would sit around and discuss and come up with options. Where by the end of the year the principal would come with the teachers’ contract book and would say “Well, it says this thing here and that is how we are going to handle it.” Even when other options existed or were wanted. It has just been going by the book, and a very strict interpretation.

This teacher resented going through the motions of a shared decision process when the real agenda seemed to be a game of using whatever rules the principal could use to her benefit.
to manipulate the staff. He also resented the arbitrariness with which the principal exercised her formal authority in order to assert her place of power within the school.

There has been many edicts from up above, from the principal, that have just been kind of told to us. At the beginning of the year we were told we are no longer allowed to eat lunches in the library unless we have permission. We are professionals. There were no reasons, no input. And just numerous things throughout the year-- staff has been really unhappy. And a lot of them just seem petty or trivial. If we could just have input we might be more accepting of them. But that's never an option.

The imposition of rules in a capricious manner felt like an assault on the teachers’ professionalism. This principal’s tactics to improve what she may have regarded as a lazy or unmotivated staff seemed destined for failure. Although teachers reported that most people complied with the rules, the resulting power struggle did not seem likely to improve the quality of the school’s effectiveness for students.

Conclusion

It seems evident that trust is a significant factor in well-functioning schools. Schools that enjoyed a high level of trust benefitted from faculties who willingly went above and beyond the minimum requirements of their positions. Communication flowed freely and they were not encumbered by a proliferation of rules. A high level of trust helped these schools to be wonderful places to learn and grow. The costs of broken trust were great. When distrust pervaded a school, contrived collaboration, constrained communication, poor organizational citizenship, and a proliferation of dysfunctional rules were the result. Understanding the dynamics of trust, those things that build trust, and the consequences when it is damaged, will help to make schools more productive organizations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Colleagues</th>
<th>Clients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>I think her underlying motivation is to help you be the best that you can be at what you are doing. And her underlying desire for you is nothing but good.</td>
<td>But I think that each staff member is very supportive of one another.</td>
<td>These kids, you really take them home with you. You try and think what could I do to make it better.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>I haven't been teaching for long but a lot of the staff members say how she is not a good principal.</td>
<td>As far as the professional aspect, some people I feel don't live up to their end of the deal.</td>
<td>But a lot of our students here are maybe reading and writing better than their parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>She works right and day. She is here every morning at 6:30 and she doesn't go home until things are done.</td>
<td>But usually when people have made the commitment to do something they follow through with it.</td>
<td>And we can count on them to take some of the responsibility for their child's education, carrying it out at the home, in the form of homework, or to return the slip so they can go to COSI, to have the parents sign it, things like that!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>The second grade teacher who had to go out, she had brought her in. So I think she wanted him to leave so that she would have been able to stay.</td>
<td>...the one who called him that night and told him that we had ripped him apart, that person was the main person who had [criticized him]!</td>
<td>Taking things that don't belong to you. Admitting when you are wrong. Those are issues we deal with, if not on a daily basis, then every other day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>From the administrator, he keeps everybody informed of what's happening down at Central Office.</td>
<td>And I think we all have that sense that we can speak freely and feel that it will be accepted for what it is</td>
<td>Well, I guess I just look at a parent who is willing to communicate with me, and talk with me, and let's have a respectful give and take about what is going on.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: Sample of how various text units were coded.
CHAPTER 6
QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

The quantitative phase of this study was conducted to determine whether there was a statistically significant relationship between trust and collaboration in school settings. Two newly developed survey instruments were utilized: a trust survey and a collaboration survey. The study took place in the schools of one large urban district. Three measures or sub-scales measured trust with three different referent groups: the principal, colleagues, and clients (students and parents combined). Collaboration was measured using four referent groups and two levels of decision making--collaboration with the principal and with parents on school-level decisions, collaboration with colleagues and with students on classroom-level decisions. Factor analyses were used to refine the instruments. A correlational analysis tested the hypotheses proposed at the end of Chapter 3. Further analysis using multiple regression and canonical correlation revealed an interesting and even surprising pattern of relationships. Results are reported below.

Factor Analysis and Reliability

Factor analysis, using principal component analysis, was conducted to insure that all items in the measures used were strongly related to the other items and were valid measures of the constructs. In general the factor loadings were strong and consistent with expectations.
Varimax orthogonal rotation was utilized. Items that loaded on more than one factor at .40 or above, or that loaded lower than .40 on any one factor were eliminated.

**Factor analysis of the trust survey.** Factor analysis of the trust measure resulted in the elimination of four items due to poor factor loading. These revealed some interesting patterns. On the Trust in Colleagues subscale one item, TT7 "Teachers in this school do their jobs well," was eliminated because it loaded on more than one factor--it loaded on Trust in Colleagues (.72) but also on Trust in Students (.46). It also had a dual loading in the pilot study but was retained because it was the only measure of teacher competence. TPA3r "Teachers avoid making contact with parents" loaded almost equally with Trust in Clients and Trust in Colleagues (.49 and .50, respectively). And TS7 "Teachers in this school show concern for their students" loaded as expected on Trust in Colleagues (.58) but was confounded by the level of trust in the principal (.66). These last two items had not suffered from dual loadings in the pilot study.

Factor loadings for the ten retained items for Trust in the Principal subscale ranged from .82 to .94. This subscale had a reliability of .98 using Cronbach’s alpha. Loadings for the remaining eight items in Trust in Colleagues ranged from .84 to .94. The reliability for this subscale was also .98. Loadings for Trust in Clients, which included items about trust in students as well as trust in parents, ranged from .64 to .92. Cronbach’s alpha for this subscale, with the fifteen remaining items, was .97. See Table 6.1. These factor loadings and reliabilities were considered good, and they support the reliability and validity of the instrument.
Factor analysis of the collaboration survey. Factor analysis of the Collaboration Survey also provided strong support for the instrument. Items that tapped Collaboration with the Principal on school-level decisions had factor loadings that ranged from .59 to .87 with a reliability of .93. Collaboration with Colleagues over classroom-level decisions had factor loadings ranged from .70 to .89 with an alpha of .97. Items that assessed collaboration with parents had factor loadings from .74 to .86, with an alpha of .95. The range of factor loadings for faculty collaboration with students was .76 to .90 with an alpha of .94. See Table 6.2.

Based on the strong factor loadings only three items were removed from the analysis because these items loaded with Collaboration with Colleagues on classroom-level decisions rather than Collaboration with the Principal on school-level decisions as expected. Items concerning the allocation of financial and time resources also had had dual loadings in the pilot study but were modified in an attempt to clarify their meaning. In the pilot study two items concerning school improvement--"determining areas in need of school improvement" and "identifying resources for school improvement"--had been removed for dual loadings. In this phase of the study "planning of school improvement" was also removed because it loaded both on school- and classroom-level decision domains. Determining personnel needs and designing building modification had dual loadings with collaboration with the principal and collaboration with colleagues, but the factor loading were strong enough to retain them in the analysis. See Table 6.2. Other than these few, all factor loadings were strong and loaded as expected.

Factor structure stability. The factor structure for both the Trust Survey and the Collaboration Survey were very similar to those found in the pilot study. This demonstrated
a reasonably stable factor structure. Reliabilities were even higher than those found in the pilot study. These results demonstrate that the Trust Survey and the Collaboration Survey were reliable instruments with stable factor structures. Kerlinger (1973) argues that factor analysis is perhaps the most powerful method of construct validation. The findings of this study support the construct validity of both of these measures. It seems apparent that the five proposed elements of trust--benevolence, reliability, competence, honesty, and openness--belong to an overall factor of trust, and that participants make distinct judgments concerning these dimensions depending on the referents of trust, whether it be the principal, colleagues or clients. The factor structure of the collaboration measure also remained stable from the pilot study. Although for a few items there was some blurring of the distinction between school- and classroom-level decisions among teachers, in general four distinct levels or types of collaboration emerged.

Correlations

The hypothesis that trust is related to collaboration were tested in a correlational analysis using Pearson Product Moment Correlations. See Table 6.3. Trust in the Principal was positively and significantly related to Collaboration with the Principal, as predicted ($r = .41, p < .01$); the more faculty trust the principal, the more they collaborate with the principal. Trust in the Principal was also related to Collaboration with Colleagues ($r = .64, p < .01$) and Collaboration with Parents ($r = .45, p < .01$). When faculty trust the principal they are more likely to be involved in collaboration with other teachers and with parents.

The second hypothesis, that Trust in Colleagues would be related to Collaboration with Colleagues was not confirmed. There may be a high level of trust among a faculty
whether or not there is a high level of collaboration; conversely, a high level of collaboration may or may not indicate a high level of trust. The only collaboration variable that Trust in Colleagues was significantly related to was Collaboration with Parents ($r = .37, p < .05$). When faculty trust one another they are more likely to be involved in collaborative relationships with parents.

The third and fourth hypotheses are somewhat blurred because of the way that trust in parents and trust in students merged into one subscale--Trust in Clients. Trust in Clients was strongly and positively correlated with Collaboration with Parents ($r = .79, p < .01$), which suggests a partial confirmation of Hypothesis 4. However, Trust in Clients was not related to Collaboration with Students, discounting the claim of the third hypothesis. Trust in Clients was also related to Collaboration with the Principal ($r = .42, p < .01$), and Collaboration with Colleagues ($r = .48, p < .01$). In schools where there is a high level of trust in the parents and in students, there is more likely to be collaboration between the principal and the faculty on school-level decisions, and among the faculty on classroom-level decisions.

Collaboration with Students was not significantly related to any of the trust variables. It was also not related to Collaboration with Parents, but it was significantly related to Collaboration with the Principal ($r = .47, p < .01$) and Collaboration with Colleagues ($r = .46, p < .01$). Whether teachers include students in making classroom-level decisions may be more related to pedagogical or curricular leanings than whether or not teachers trust students. However, the level of collaboration within the building, that is, with the principal and with colleagues, seems to make a difference in the likelihood that teachers will include students
in classroom collaboration. Trust in Clients was also not significantly related to the use of cooperative learning experiences within a school (r = .24), but the level of Trust in the Principal (r = .31, p < .05) and Trust in Colleagues (r = .35, p < .05) were significantly related to the use of cooperative learning methods. In addition, when faculty collaborated with one another they more often used cooperative learning methods with students (r = .41, p < .01), and when teachers collaborated with students on classroom-level decisions the teachers were more likely to make use of cooperative learning techniques (r = .40, p < .01).

Principals were asked to report whether teachers, parents, and students participated through a formal committee structure in the same set of decision domains teachers were asked about their level of collaboration. The number of decision domains in which participation was indicated became the participation score. The participation scores were not significantly correlated to an overall measure of collaboration consisting of the mean of the four collaboration measures (r = .23). The finding supported the premise that participation and collaboration are not the same thing.

**Multiple Regression**

Multiple regression analysis examines the linear relationship between two or more independent variables and a dependent variable to analyze the variability in the dependent variable. The analysis explores how much of the variance in the dependent variable can be explained by the combined set of independent variables, as well as the relative influence of each of the independent variables, controlling for each of the others. In four separate analyses each of the collaboration variables was regressed on the set of three trust variables. See Table 6.4.
When a combination of trust factors was used, 22% of the variance in collaboration with the Principal was explained by a combination of the trust variables. Trust in Clients was the only trust variable that had an independent effect on Collaboration with the Principal (beta = .37). Although in a simple correlational analysis Trust in the Principal was related to collaboration with the principal, when all of the trust variables were included, Trust in the Principal did not make a significant independent contribution to the prediction of Collaboration with the Principal.

In exploring collaboration with colleagues in classroom-level decisions, 47% of the variance was explained by a combination of the trust variables. Both Trust in Clients and Trust in the Principal predicted Collaboration with Colleagues on classroom-level decisions (beta = .56, and .28, respectively). Trust in Colleagues proved to be a weak predictor. It did not make a significant independent contribution to any of the collaboration variables. It is intriguing that Trust in Colleagues was not related to Collaboration with Colleagues on classroom-level decisions.

Collaboration with Parents on School-level Decisions was explained by a linear combination of the trust variables, explaining 64% percent of the variance. Trust in Clients was the only trust variable that had an independent effect on Collaboration with Parents (beta = .72). Neither Trust in the Principal nor Trust in Colleagues made a significant independent contribution to the prediction of Collaboration with the Parents. None of the trust variables predicted Collaboration with Students, in fact less than 1% of the variance in Collaboration with Students could be explained by a combination of the trust variables. As suggested by
the correlational analysis, teachers’ willingness to collaborate with student in running the classroom may be related to issues other than their trust in the students.

Multiple regression revealed a complex set of interrelationships between trust and collaboration. Although support for two of the four hypotheses predicting relationships within organizational levels of trust and collaboration were found using simple correlational analyses, e.g. Trust in the Principal is related to Collaboration with the Principal, the regression analysis suggests the interweaving of trust and collaboration relationships across hierarchical levels. The regression analysis was informative, not only for the relationships it revealed but in the lack of certain relationships. When all three levels of trust were allowed to compete in their predictive power for the level of collaboration the results were more complicated. Only in the case of Trust in Clients predicting Collaboration with Parents did these simple within-level correlations hold up. Collaboration with the Principal was not strongly predicted by Trust in the Principal, nor was Collaboration with Colleagues predicted by Trust in Colleagues. Trust in Clients proved to be a powerful predictor; in fact, Trust in Clients was the only variable that had an independent effect on Collaboration with the Principal and Collaboration with Parents.

**Canonical Correlation**

Canonical correlation is a procedure for investigating the relationship between two sets of variables. It was used to explore the extent to which the level of collaboration in a school, as measured by the set of four collaboration subscales, could be explained or predicted by the level of trust, as measured in three subscales. The descriptive statistics for each of the seven subscales is displayed on Table 6.5 to demonstrate that the assumption that
variances not be restricted has been met. Intercorrelations between each of the subscales are reported in Table 6.3.

Because there were three trust variables three canonical correlations resulted from the analysis, but only the first correlation was significant and therefore only it was interpreted. Results show a strong relationship between trust and collaboration. The squared canonical correlation was .67, indicating that 67% of the variance in collaboration could be explained by the set of trust variables. The standardized canonical coefficients indicated the relative importance of each of the variables. In the set of trust variables, Trust in Clients made the strongest contribution to the explanation of collaboration with a weight of .79. Trust in the Principal had a weight of .37 while Trust in Colleagues added little explanatory power. The structure coefficients indicated that Trust in Clients was correlated .94 with the variate score for trust, while Trust in the Principal was correlated at .71 and Trust in Colleagues at .42.

The structure coefficients for collaboration indicated that collaboration with parents was strongly related to the collaboration variate score, at .95. Collaboration with colleagues and with the principal were also strongly related, with correlations of .75 and .57, respectively. With a structure coefficient less than .30, collaboration with students was not considered meaningful. The standardized canonical coefficients for collaboration indicated that collaboration with parents made the strongest contribution to the relationship with the set of trust variables, with a weight of .80. Collaboration with colleagues made the next strongest contribution with a weight of .42. Collaboration with the principal added little explanatory power.
An urban district was selected for this study because there was an expectation from the literature that transience and diversity would make trust more difficult. A second canonical correlation was used to see if this was the case. This analysis revealed an interesting pattern of relationships between the set of trust variables with the demographics of the student body, specifically the socioeconomic status of students (measured as the proportion receiving free and reduced price lunches), the racial mix of the student body (measured as the proportion of the student body that was black because the proportion of other minority racial groups in the district was very small), and the mobility of the student body (measured as the annual rate of student turnover in a building). See Table 6.6.

The squared canonical correlation for these two sets of variables was .75, suggesting that 75% of the trust in a school building can be explained by characteristics of the student body. Only the first of the three canonical correlations was significant and was interpreted. The structure coefficients indicated that all three of the demographic variables were significantly correlated to the demographic variate score. The percent of students of low socioeconomic status was essentially the same as the variate score, with a correlation of 99%. The annual percent of student mobility and of the percent of students who were black correlated -.72 and -.37, respectively. The standardized canonical coefficients indicated that the student socioeconomic status had the greatest explanatory power, with a weight of -.87. Student mobility and student race played a much less significant role.

Among the trust variables, Trust in Clients was most strongly correlated with the trust variate score at .97. Trust in Colleagues was related at .35, while Trust in the Principal was not related strongly enough to be considered meaningful. The standardized canonical
correlations showed Trust in Clients to have a very strong weight, with 1.05, while Trust in Colleagues was insignificant.

Canonical correlation proved to be a useful tool in analyzing the sets of variables under consideration in this study. Each of the two analyses resulted in strong squared canonical correlations, indicating strong explanatory power. Among the set of trust variables Trust in Clients most strongly predicted the set of collaboration variables, which was carried most strongly by Collaboration with Parents. Among student demographic variables the socioeconomic status of students was much stronger than student race or student mobility in predicting the set of trust variables. Trust in Clients was the strongest of the trust measures.

Summary

The quantitative phase of this study explored the relationship between trust and collaboration in school settings. For this purpose two survey instruments, a trust survey and a collaboration survey, were developed and tested. A pilot study of the two instruments provided reasonable evidence of validity and reliability. The instruments were then used on a sample of 45 schools in one urban district. Factor analysis demonstrated strong factors with high loadings and high reliabilities. Correlational analysis confirmed the relationship between trust and collaboration, however only two of the four hypothesized relationships was supported. Trust in the Principal was positively related to the level of Collaboration with the Principal, and Trust in Clients was related to Collaboration with Parents. Multiple regression and canonical analyses provided a more sophisticated exploration of the interrelationships between these two sets of variables. Trust in Clients was the only predictor that had an
independent effect on Collaboration with Principal and on Collaboration with Parents in a multiple regression analysis. Both Trust in Clients and Trust in the Principal predicted Collaboration with Colleagues, even though Trust in Colleagues was not significantly related to collaboration at this level. Canonical correlation reinforced the importance of Trust In Clients in predicting the overall level of collaboration within a school. Collaboration with Parents was the most potent of the collaboration variables in this analysis, but Collaboration with Colleagues also made a strong contribution. Collaboration with the Principal added little explanatory power. It seems that the relationships between trust and collaboration in schools are more complex than the simple correlational hypotheses predicted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item code</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Three Factor Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPR2</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>6. The principal in this school typically acts with the best interests of the teachers in mind.</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR19</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>47. Teachers in this school can rely on the principal.</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR3r</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>14. The principal in this school is unresponsive to teachers’ concerns.</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR11</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>48. The principal in this school is competent in doing his or her job.</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR1</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>5. The teachers in this school have faith in the integrity of the principal.</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR6r</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>23. The principal of this school does not show concern for the teachers.</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR4r</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>15. The principal doesn’t tell teachers what is really going on.</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR5</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>22. Teachers in this school trust the principal.</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR7r</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>34. The teachers in this school are suspicious of most of the principal’s actions.</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>35. The principal in this school keeps his or her word.</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPR9</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>46. The principal openly shares personal information with teachers.</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Faculty Trust in Colleagues**  
Alpha = .98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item code</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TT4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>8. Even in difficult situations, teachers in this school can depend on each other.</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT3</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>7. Teachers in this school believe in each other.</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT5</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>20. Teachers in this school have faith in the integrity of their colleagues.</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT2</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>2. Teachers in this school trust each other.</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT9</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>36. Teachers in this school are open with each other.</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1. Teachers in this school typically look out for each other.</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT6r</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>21. Teachers in this school are suspicious of each other.</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT8</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>31. When teachers in this school tell you something you can believe it.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>30. Teachers in this school do their jobs well.</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: Trust item analysis. (Continued)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Dim</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TPA1</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Teachers can count on the parents in this school.</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS9</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Students in this school are reliable.</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPA5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Parents in this school are reliable in their commitments.</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPA4</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Teachers think most of the parents do a good job.</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS5</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Students in this school can be counted on to do their work.</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Students are caring toward one another.</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPA6</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Teachers in this school trust the parents to support them.</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS3</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>The students in this school have to be closely supervised.</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPA2</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Teachers can believe what parents tell them.</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS1</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teachers in this school believe what students say.</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS2</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Teachers in this school trust their students.</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS11</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>Teachers here believe students are competent learners.</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS10r</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Students here are secretive.</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS4r</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Students in this school cheat if they have the chance.</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS8</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>The students in this school talk freely about their lives outside of school.</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS7</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Teachers in this school show concern for their students. [DL]</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPA3r</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Teachers avoid making contact with parents. [DL]</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Teachers and School Decisions

To what extent do teachers have influence over the outcome of these decisions?  
*Alpha = .93*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Decision Domain</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDMPR 6</td>
<td>Selecting personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMPR 5</td>
<td>Determining criteria for selecting personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMPR 7</td>
<td>Assigning and reassigning personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMPR 8</td>
<td>Evaluating personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMPR 4</td>
<td>Determining personnel needs [DL]</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMPR 9</td>
<td>Determining how to allocate space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMPR 10</td>
<td>Designing building modifications [DL]</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMPR 2</td>
<td>Determining how to allocate time (e.g., scheduling) [UL]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMPR 3</td>
<td>Determining how to allocate financial resources [UL]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMPR 1</td>
<td>Planning school improvement [UL]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Collective Decision Making With Teacher Colleagues

To what extent do teacher committees influence decisions of this kind?  
*Alpha = .97*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Decision Domain</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDMT 24</td>
<td>Planning professional development activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMT 28</td>
<td>Resolving student behavior problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMT 23</td>
<td>Determining professional development needs and goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMT 25</td>
<td>Selecting instructional methods and activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMT 26</td>
<td>Evaluating curriculum and programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMT 22</td>
<td>Determining student placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMT 27</td>
<td>Resolving student learning problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMT 21</td>
<td>Determining consequences for rule-breaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMT 29</td>
<td>Developing procedures for reporting student progress to parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMT 20</td>
<td>Determining school rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2: Collaboration item analysis.

(Continued)
Table 6.2 (Continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Decision Domain</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDMPA 19</td>
<td>Approving extracurricular activities</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMPA 11</td>
<td>Determining areas in need of improvement</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMPA 12</td>
<td>Planning school improvement</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMPA 15</td>
<td>Fostering community relations</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMPA 14</td>
<td>Determining how to allocate resources (e.g. the school budget)</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMPA 16</td>
<td>Resolving problems with community groups</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMPA 13</td>
<td>Determining curriculum priorities</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMPA 18</td>
<td>Determining how to comply with mandates, legislation, etc.</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMPA 17</td>
<td>Determining school rules and regulations</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Decision Domain</th>
<th>F1</th>
<th>F2</th>
<th>F3</th>
<th>F4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDMS 31</td>
<td>Determining consequences for classroom rule-breaking</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMS 34</td>
<td>Evaluation of student work</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMS 33</td>
<td>Selecting instructional methods and activities</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMS 30</td>
<td>Determining classroom rules</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMS 32</td>
<td>Selecting curriculum content</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDMS 35</td>
<td>Resolving student behavior problems</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
N = 45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Trust in Principal</td>
<td>.365**</td>
<td>.416**</td>
<td>.414**</td>
<td>.640**</td>
<td>.447**</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>.314*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Trust in Colleagues</td>
<td>.345*</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.370*</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.350*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Trust in Clients</td>
<td></td>
<td>.417**</td>
<td>.483**</td>
<td>.788**</td>
<td>.211</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Collaboration with Principal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.792**</td>
<td>.518**</td>
<td>.474**</td>
<td>.222</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Collaboration with Colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.543**</td>
<td>.462**</td>
<td>414*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Collaboration with Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Collaboration with Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.395**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Cooperative Learning Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05
** p < .01

Table 6.3: Intercorrelations between trust and collaboration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable and Predictors</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with the Principal</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Principal</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Colleagues</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Clients</td>
<td>.373*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with Colleagues</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Principal</td>
<td>.556**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Colleagues</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Clients</td>
<td>.284*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with Parents</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Principal</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Colleagues</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Clients</td>
<td>.716**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with Students</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Principal</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Colleagues</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Clients</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.4: Regression analysis of collaboration.
### Summary of Canonical Correlation Analysis

| Canonical Variate 1 |  |  |  |  |
|--------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------
|                    | Standardized canonical coefficients (weights) | Structure Coefficients | $R^2_c = .67$ |
| For Independent Variable Set |  |  |  |  |
| Trust in the Principal | .37 | .70 | |
| Trust in Colleagues | -.01 | .42 | |
| Trust in Clients | .79 | .94 | |
| For Dependent Variable Set |  |  |  |  |
| Collaboration with the Principal | -.08 | .57 | |
| Collaboration with Colleagues | .42 | .75 | |
| Collaboration with Parents | .80 | .95 | |
| Collaboration with Students | -.10 | .29 | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Principal</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Colleagues</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Clients</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with Principal</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with Colleagues</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with Parents</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with Students</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.5: Canonical correlation of trust and collaboration.
## Summary of Canonical Correlation Analysis

| Canonical Variate 1 |  |  | $R_c^2 = .75$ |
|--------------------|---------------|----------------|
|                    | Standardized Canonical Coefficients (weights) | Structure Coefficients |
|        |                |      |               |
| For Independent Variable Set |                |      |               |
| % Students of low SES | -.87 | -.99 |               |
| % Annual Student Mobility | -.18 | -.72 |               |
| % Students who are Black | -.03 | -.37 |               |

| For Dependent Variable Set |    |      |               |
| Trust in the Principal | -.28 | .09  |               |
| Trust in Colleagues   | .02  | .35  |               |
| Trust in Clients      | 1.05 | .97  |               |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N = 45 Variable</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Principal</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Colleagues</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in Clients</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Students of low SES</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>66.26</td>
<td>21.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Annual Student Mobility</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33.93</td>
<td>28.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Students who are Black</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>54.16</td>
<td>27.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.6: Canonical correlation of trust and demographic variables.
CHAPTER 7

DISCUSSION

Trust is like the children's game of Chutes and Ladders. It builds slowly, step by step over time, but when it is broken it can be a long slide down, very fast. The beginning of that slide is often accompanied with the feeling of being stunned or reeling in disbelief. By the time we make our exit at the bottom of the chute we are usually angry and often thirsty for revenge (Bies & Tripp, 1996). Trust has been the subject of philosophers, politicians, and poets throughout history--betrayal is not new. However, over the past four decades trust has become the subject of empirical study.

Trust is most evident in its absence, after it has been damaged or broken (Baier, 1986). When we experience a betrayal, distrust rivets our attention, consuming energy and imagination as we decide how we will respond and protect ourselves from further harm. Each of the four decades of trust studies has been sparked by a different betrayal or lapse of trust. The year 1958 saw the unveiling of a program of the study of trust in response to the Cold War, and the dangerous cycle of escalating distrust that threatened to bring the world to the brink of self-annihilation (Deutsch, 1958). In an era when science was providing answers to humanity's most intractable problems but had also provided us the means to destroy ourselves, it was hoped that the scientific study of trust could provide a way out of the conundrum we had set for ourselves. The study of trust took place using tightly controlled
experimental games, varying only one factor at a time to witness the effect. This program of empirical studies produced over 2,000 articles before it ran its course (Dawes, Van de Kragt, & Orbell, 1990).

By the late 1960s, at the close of a decade that had witnessed the assassination of a president, a senator, and a civil rights leader, increasingly loud protest to get out of an unwinnable war, and disturbing revelations of political corruption, a new chapter in the study of trust was introduced. As the nation struggled to understand a generation of young adults who were disillusioned and suspicious of the authority figures and institutions of society, trust as a generalized personality trait became the object of study (Rotter, 1967). Researchers wanted to know to what extent, based on early experiences, general attitudes of trust or suspiciousness could take hold in the personality and what were the likely consequences of those attitudes.

A decade later, the focus of the study of trust again shifted. With the pressure of the woman’s movement and the sexual revolution changing notions of what people owed one another in intimate relationships, and in a period of an unprecedented rise in divorce rates, the focus of studies of trust moved to interpersonal relationships (Johnson-George & Swap, 1982; Larzelere & Huston, 1980; Rempel, Holmes, & Zanna, 1985).

During the 1980s and 1990s, driven by new forms of management required to compete in a global economy, the advent of new technologies, and pressures toward downsizing, profound changes have taken place in what companies and employees expect that they owe to one another. In its fourth decade, the study of trust has turned to
organizational science (Gambetta, 1988; Kramer & Tyler, 1996; Shaw, 1997), sociology (Coleman, 1990), and economics (Fukuyama, 1995).

At the dawn of not only a new decade but a new century and a new millennium, trust has become the focus of study in schools. Public schools serve at the pleasure of the public. Changing expectations have created dissatisfaction and distrust in schools. Pressures for privatization and a home schooling movement have been spawned by this distrust. There are increasing calls to toughen standards for both teachers and students, as well as to end or amend tenure protections for teachers (Ratnesar, 1998). When administrators make foolish decisions, it is broadcast in the media. Government reports and non-governmental think tanks produce dire statistics and forecasts (e.g., A Nation at Risk). Everyone seems to have an opinion about what is wrong with education. Once again, when changing expectations have caused trust to decay, there is a need for the study of trust.

Despite all of the interest in the study of trust, it has been a difficult construct to study, in part because it has been difficult to define. Everyone has an intuitive sense of what it is to trust another, and yet trying to describe precisely what is meant by trust has proven difficult. Articulating a definition of trust has posed difficulties to those who would study it, whether in the context of interpersonal, organizational, or societal relationships. Trust is a complex and dynamic construct. It is complex because it is multi-dimensional. These elements vary separately, vary in intensity, and have differential importance depending on the nature of the vulnerability between the parties. Trust is embedded in relationships; the referent of trust influences its meaning. Adding to the complexity is the observation that people can hold two sets of expectations of the same person simultaneously. For example,
people can hold one set of expectations of what they owe to one another as organizational role incumbents, and the second of what they owe to one another as fellow human beings. These two sets of expectations can operate somewhat independently. Trust is also a dynamic process that changes over the course of a relationship. It builds slowly but can be destroyed in an instant, through a casual comment, a betrayed confidence, or an action that violates the sense of care one has expected from another. These dimensions and dynamics, as well as their implications in the relationships in schools have been the focus of this study. Results in each of these areas are discussed below.

Elements of Trust

Various ways that trust has been defined over the past four decades of study were examined in Chapter Two in order to search for patterns and commonalities. As a result of this search a five-dimensional model of trust was proposed. Trust was defined as one party’s willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the latter party is (a) benevolent, (b) reliable, (c) competent, (d) honest, and (e) open (adapted from Butler & Cantrell, 1984, and Mishra, 1996). This new model had not been tested empirically.

This five-dimensional model was confirmed in both quantitative and qualitative phases of this study. Kerlinger (1973) has suggested that factor analysis is a powerful tool for determining construct validity. It was not known whether all five proposed elements—benevolence, reliability, competence, honesty, and openness—would load on a single factor along with more general statements of trust. In all three referent groups—principals, colleagues, and clients—all five elements loaded together with general statements of trust or a willingness to be vulnerable. The factor structure was consistent in both the pilot and final
samples, giving added support to the validity of the construct. In addition, the reliabilities for each of the three levels of trust, Trust in the Principal, Trust in Colleagues, and Trust in Clients, were high, suggesting that there was internal consistency and that the test items were homogeneous (Kerlinger, 1986). In brief, each operational measure taps all five elements of trust, is reliable, and has strong validity support. These results provided cogent evidence in support of the five-dimensional model of trust.

One of the unexpected findings of this study was that trust in students and trust in parents were one level of trust, not two. They converged to form one factor and were statistically indistinguishable from one another. Data from the qualitative phase of the study supported this finding. Comments made during interviews indicated that, at least at the elementary level, teachers ascribe higher or lower trust to parents based on the behavior of their children. In fact, several asserted that when a child misbehaved it was not the child they mistrusted but the parents of that child. Trust was extended through the child to the parents.

The qualitative phase of this study provided insight into the differential weight that each of the five dimensions played across organizational levels. Although each of the elements was mentioned across all three organizational levels, in general, more emphasis was given to the areas where greater interdependence or vulnerability were perceived. These findings reinforce the notion that where there is no vulnerability, trust does not come into play. Some elements of trust, particularly honesty, seemed to be assumed and did not come to mind unless the participant recalled an incident where they had been broken.
Benevolence

Across all three organizational levels, benevolence was the most frequently mentioned dimension of trust. No matter what the relative power of participants in an organization, they wanted to be able to count on the good will of others, whether it was the principal, colleagues, parents or students. This element was particularly important when one was aware of one’s vulnerability to someone who occupied a higher level in the organizational hierarchy and consequently held a certain amount of power over one’s fate. When principals earned a reputation of support and good will for teachers, teachers were willing to extend the benefit of doubt on those occasions when the principal was short-tempered or preoccupied. Principals who were seen as abusing their power, through the manipulative use of classroom assignment or unfair evaluations created low trust with the entire faculty, even those who were not the direct recipients of these tactics but simply witnessed them and feared that they could also become victims.

When the referent of trust had less organizational power, the nature of the vulnerability was different, and the character of benevolence expected was somewhat changed. In the case of students and parents the good will that teachers were looking for was most often characterized as respect. Teachers trusted students who seemed to have respect for themselves, for other students, and for teachers, as well as a willingness to cooperate with the system and structure of school. This sense of respect also held an element of self-control and overlapped somewhat with a sense of reliability.
Reliability

Reliability or dependability was closely linked to both benevolence and competence in the relationships in schools. When it came to principals, teachers wanted to know that they could count on their principal to be available to help them if they were having difficulty. They also wanted to know that the principal was going to address whatever problems might emerge, whether the problem was personnel who were not doing their jobs, a hostile parent, or a leaky roof. Teachers wanted to have a sense of confidence that the principal would stay on the job until the task was completed. It was difficult for teachers to be reliable in their commitments to the school when they saw the principal as slipping away from school during the school day or leaving shortly after school was dismissed.

Teachers also wanted to know they could count on colleagues to come through on shared commitments. They were disappointed when colleagues failed to attend committee meetings or were half-hearted in fulfilling their duty to students. Teachers wanted to be able to count on one another to cover their classes when emergencies arose, and to do so with a helpful and positive attitude.

Competence

Competence played a larger role in teachers’ trust judgments of principals than would have been predicted from previous research of trust across organizational levels (Gabarro, 1978; Kramer, 1996). When teachers perceived a lack of competence on the part of the principal they seemed to feel that their jobs were made harder because they either had to step in to fill the gap in areas where they did not have the authority or expertise to act or they had
to isolate themselves in order to protect themselves from the problems that poor management wrought.

One teacher related that he did not feel that the competence of his colleagues mattered to him in terms of his level of trust with them, he did not perceive a significant level of interdependence. Perhaps when faced with several colleagues that he considered incompetent, he looked for a way to maintain his friendship and so relied only on personal rather than professional judgments of trust. Admitting that one’s colleagues were incompetent may have broken the norm of equal status in the teaching profession (Ashton, Webb, & Doda, 1983; Little, 1990).

On the other hand, to many teachers the competence of their colleagues mattered a great deal. They were frustrated when they perceived that a colleague was not fulfilling his or her responsibility to students. In the quantitative study, an item tapping teachers competence “Teachers in this school do their jobs well” loaded with other elements of trust in colleagues (.71), but also loaded on Trust in Clients (.45). In future versions of this scale, this item concerning teacher competence could be reworded in an attempt to assess teachers’ competence apart from that of students. Perhaps a negatively worded item (e.g., Teachers in this school are not competent in their teaching responsibilities.) would be less likely to be confounded by Trust in Clients. Reform efforts that stress greater emphasis on school-wide accountability seem likely to increase the teachers’ awareness of their interdependence and may make competence an even stronger factor.
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Honesty

Baier (1986) observed that trust is most evident when it is damaged. For the most part teachers tended to have faith in the integrity of their colleagues and principals, and honesty did not often come up as an issue of concern. However, in the few instances where a colleague or principal was found to have lied, or taken others’ belongings, the damage to trust was severe. Teachers expressed an unwillingness to forgive that person or to extend trust in the future. With students, teachers were more forgiving. They were willing to see their students as children who were bound to make mistakes in judgment from time to time, and also to see them as products of their environment. On the trust survey, items concerning the integrity of one’s principal or colleagues had high factor loadings (.92, and .92), where items tapping a willingness to believe what colleagues, parents, or students had to say were somewhat lower (.84, .84, and .80, respectively).

Openness

Trust is based on expectations. When asked a question about the general level of trust among the faculty, teachers spontaneously drew a distinction between professional and personal trust. The distinction these teachers made between professional and personal trust suggests that there are two different sets of expectations that teachers feel they owe one another. What they owed to one another as role occupants and what they owed to one another as people were not necessarily the same. Although there was overlap, these two kinds of trust seemed to be somewhat independent from each other. On a professional level, teachers expected the principal to share relevant information with them, whether about district-level decisions or matters pertaining to the running of the school. Teachers expected other faculty
members to share resources, ideas, and advice. In schools where this kind of sharing was not forthcoming, teachers were disappointed and even counted it as sufficient reason to request a transfer to another building. On a personal level, openness about one’s life outside of school signaled a willingness to be vulnerable to others, with the expectation of a benevolent response. Where benevolence was lacking people preferred to keep information about their personal lives to themselves.

On the trust survey items that asked about a willingness to share information about their lives outside of school—“The principal openly shares personal information with teachers” (in the Trust in the Principal subscale) and “The students in this school talk freely about their lives outside of school” (in the Trust in Clients subscale) -- had among the lowest loadings (.44, and .62, respectively). A similar item, “Teachers in this school don’t share much about their lives outside of school” was removed from the Trust in Colleagues subscale in the pilot study because it loaded more strongly on Trust in the Principal. These findings suggest that when teachers were reluctant to share personal information it was because they feared negative repercussions from the principal rather than the expected level of benevolence from colleagues. Some schools seemed to have a culture that supported this kind of sharing, and teachers felt good about the sense of community and caring response that this sharing brought. One teacher in a school where sharing was not the norm advanced a theory reminiscent of Rotter’s (1967) theory, that when people chose not to share it was as much because of a personality trait as it was in response to the climate of the school. Future study might try to clarify the differences between professional and personal trust and to explore more deeply the differences in openness.
These five elements or dimensions of trust (benevolence, reliability, competence, honesty, and integrity) all contributed to teachers judgments of trust, whether the referent of trust was the principal, colleagues, or students and parents. When combined they provide a glimpse into the ways trust plays out in the relationships in schools.

Profiles of Trust

What does trust look like in the relationships in schools? Below is a description of high trust relationships at each of the three levels in this study—the principal, colleagues, and clients. These descriptions are supported by both the qualitative and the quantitative results in this study.

The high trust principal. The principal who is highly trusted is one who first and foremost is a person of good will. The teachers are confident that this person has their best interests at heart and will do whatever is possible to help them develop as professionals. Even when a faculty member comes to this principal with a problem of a personal nature, this principal listens intently and offers help or advice from his or her own experience. This does not mean that teachers are not held accountable. On the contrary, this principal has high expectations for teachers’ performance, but these expectations are bolstered by the support and guidance to help faculty meet these standards. This principal models hard work and dedication, is engaged with the faculty and aware of what is going on in the building. When a faculty member fails to meet expectations, this principal addresses the issues directly but discretely and in a way that preserves that person’s dignity. This principal is honest and fair in dealings with the faculty, with students, and with parents. The high trust principal is predictable, not arbitrary or capricious. This person does not abuse his or her power through
manipulation or an over-reliance on a strict interpretation of rules. And this person keep the faculty, students, and parents informed about matters that are of importance to them.

A high trust faculty. A faculty who trust one another is a faculty who is concerned and caring for one another. This caring is not limited to the small group of people one feels closest to but extends to every person on the faculty. On a professional level this faculty looks out for one another, especially when a person is new to the building. Teachers freely share ideas and resources. On a personal level people are also willing to share about their lives outside of school with the expectation that they will receive a caring response. Teachers respect one another’s expertise and enjoy a strong sense of shared commitment to the mission of the school. There is not a sense of competition to outdo one another or to prove who is a better teacher. There is not a sense of defensiveness about one’s own classroom or classroom performance. Teachers welcome one another into their classrooms, whether informally for a visit or to borrow something, or more formally for an observation. Teachers are not worried about being judged harshly or unfairly. Teachers respect each other’s integrity and can count on one another to be reliable in their commitments.

Trusting students and parents. In making trust judgments about children, teachers were looking for students with internal control, children who not only exercised self-discipline but who were willing to cooperate with the system of school. They were looking for respect—respect of teachers and other adults, respect for other children, and respect for self. All of the other elements of trust—judgments of competence, reliability, honesty and openness—seemed to follow from this baseline assessment of respect. Teachers wanted to feel that the parents of their students were as concerned about the children’s well-being as
they themselves were. They also wanted the parents to believe the teachers had the child’s best interest at heart and were willing to work together to solve any problems as a team. This echoes the admonition that in order to receive trust one must extend trust. Teachers also trusted students and parents who avoided blame but were willing to take responsibility for their own actions and encouraged their children to do the same.

The results of this study supported the five-dimensional model of trust. Although each of the elements took on a somewhat different flavor depending on the referent of trust, the basic underlying construct of trust was the same. Whether the trusted person held a position of greater power within the organizational hierarchy or occupied a lower position had an impact on the importance that each of the elements played. One surprising finding was that people seemed to be able to hold two sets of expectations for the same person simultaneously, a belief about what one expected from another in a professional capacity, and also an expectation of what one was owed as a fellow human being. This dual set of expectations was particularly evident in relationships of teachers with their colleagues.

Dynamics of Trust

Schools are social systems and, as such, the interpersonal relationships in them are embedded in a social context. That social context not only reflects but shapes the trust relationships in it. Burt and Knez (1996) proposed that the effect of the social context, the third-party gossip that takes place in an organization, would have the effect of pushing trust relationships to extremes—enhancing high trust and driving low trust even lower. There was evidence that this was the case in the schools studied. Where trust was high, newer members in the social system were encouraged to extend trust even when events might have caused
them to be guarded. In a school where trust in the principal was high, new faculty members were coached not to let an occasional display of temper or negative remark on the part of the principal interfere with their developing sense of trust. The rumor that this principal, when confronted, had been willing to apologize for a short-tempered remark enhanced trust even with those teachers who had never been the recipient of such an apology.

In a school where the faculty trust was high, it was more likely that when trust was damaged it would be repaired. Teachers were more willing to talk with the person whom had violated their trust, even when their usual tendency would be to not say anything and just avoid that person. Because they had an interest in maintaining the positive working environment and because they could anticipate a caring response, they were willing to take the risk to share their feelings with the person who had offended them. Once aired these grievances could be dealt with and trust restored. Even where a confrontation did not take place, over time hurt feelings were mended and relationships resumed on a positive note.

Where trust in clients was high, there was a greater willingness to give the students the benefit of doubt. There was a greater recognition that the students were, after all, just children and could be expected to make some mistakes in judgment. There seemed to be more of a tendency to be lenient with students on the first offense and to give them the opportunity to rebuild the trust that had been lost. In the high-trust schools, teachers had more social contact and more positive contacts with parents. These were opportunities to build social capital that could be “spent” in addressing the inevitable problems that arose.

In schools where trust was low, a self-perpetuating cycle of distrust seemed to drive trust even lower. Govier (1992) predicted this kind of spiral, observing that once distrust had
taken hold even innocent or neutral comments or actions would be read with suspicion. This was evident in mandatory district-level meetings for principals. In high-trust schools the resentment for the hardships this caused was directed to the district. Teachers felt almost protective of their principals in the added stress these demands required. In a low-trust school the same set of external circumstances created a different response. The resentment was visited upon the principal. Suspicion was engendered that these meeting didn’t really exist but were just the principal’s attempt to shirk her responsibility to the school. In low-trust there was little evidence that trust, once broken, would be repaired. Feuds were carried on from year to year.

In examining trust relationships across hierarchical levels, Bies and Tripp (1996) found that even small gestures would take on considerable diagnostic import for people in a lower and more vulnerable position in a hierarchy. The same dynamic was also found in the schools in this study. When teachers in one low-trust school found computer generated, xerox copied cards in their mailboxes on teacher appreciation day, they interpreted it as yet another indication of a lack of benevolence or good will on the part of the principal. On the other hand, in the high-trust schools, even small expressions of appreciation on the part of principal went a long way toward building trust. When a principal in one high-trust school, over the course of a year, found something to praise or to highlight about each teacher on her staff it quelled the sense of competition between teachers and made them more open and willing to share with one another. In other schools where only one teacher or a small group of teachers were regularly singled out for praise, it created hard feelings not only toward the principal but toward the revered teacher as well.
For principals to engender trust it took more than just being nice. Avoiding conflict by not holding people accountable to their responsibilities within the school may have helped the principal cultivate the perception of being a pleasant person, but it did not engender trust. Faculty were frustrated by one principal’s failure to enforce even minimal rules, such as arrival and departure times of faculty, much less the abuse of sick time or aids who refused to do the work they were assigned. When this principal, in the name of shared decision making, tried to get teachers to be the ones to police their own ranks but did not take action to back their attempts to deal with wayward teachers, the faculty felt betrayed.

Early research in trust found that making credible threats was as important to building trust as keeping promises (Soloman, 1960; Lindskold & Bennett, 1973). Even one example of the willingness to use force in retaliation against the opportunistic move of an opponent helped to build trust in the prisoners’ dilemma games. In one school, the principal’s continual threats that he “was not going to tolerate” certain behavior, in the absence of any action year after year, lost their credibility. On the other hand, when holding people accountable it was important that it be done discretely and in a way that preserved the persons’ dignity. Making an example of poorly performing teachers through publicly humiliating them or treating them poorly in view of the whole faculty did not foster feelings of trust in the principal.

One of the reasons that an urban district was chosen as the site of this study was because it was expected that diversity and the mobility of students would be factors in the trust relationships found. Previous research has suggested that trust is more difficult in situations of diversity because people are uncertain about the cultural norms of others.
(Kipnis, 1996) and are likely to stereotype out-group members more readily and negatively than in-group members (Mullen & Hu, 1989). People tend to make biased attributions about the capabilities, intentions, and actions of out-group members, attributing the motivations for their behavior to values or attitudes at odds with one’s own, while for in-group members people are more likely to consider situational factors that might have influenced behavior (Allison & Messick, 1985). In addition, because trust takes time to develop and requires knowledge and experience with a person over a period of time, it was expected that a high rate of mobility would be detrimental to the development of trust (Swinth, 1967).

Unexpected findings resulted from a canonical correlation in which student race, student socioeconomic status, and the annual rate of student mobility in a school were used to explain the set of trust variables (trust in the principal, in colleagues, and in clients). Racial diversity and student transience were not important determinants in the overall level of trust in a school. Only the economic class of students made a strong contribution to the explanation of the level of trust in schools. When all three student demographic characteristics were a part of the analysis, the socioeconomic status of students was essentially the same as the variate score, which explained 75% of the variance in trust. Student mobility made only a modest contribution in explaining trust, and student race made essentially no contribution at all. This suggests that when teachers make in-group and out-group distinctions about students, social class is the dividing line, not race.

Interview data provided insight into the dynamic quality of trust in ways that would have been difficult using quantitative methods. The impact of the hierarchical nature of relationships in schools as well as impact of the social context of trusting relationships
revealed the complexity of trust dynamics. The relationship of trust to some of the social processes through which organizations function is explored in the next section.

Trust and Social Processes In Schools

Relationships of trust have a very real impact on the functioning and effectiveness of an organization. People who do not trust one another are reluctant to work closely with one another. Communication becomes constrained, and organizational participants may begin to withhold their full effort and put forth only what is required of them in formal job descriptions (or perhaps even less). And the organization may respond to low levels of trust with the institution of rules that prove to be dysfunctional to the purposes of the organization. The relationship of trust to four social processes—collaboration, communication, organizational citizenship, and the proliferation of rules has been explored in this study. These are discussed below.

Collaboration

Collaboration is a popular concept in education, and yet it has been both hard to define and hard to measure. Although an examination of how collaboration has been defined in inter-organizational studies is helpful in a number of ways, it poses as many problems as it solves. Collaboration has been defined as taking place between “autonomous parties” having “equal status.” These descriptions do not map easily onto the hierarchical relationships within an organization. Collaboration also entails the sharing of responsibility, resources, and rewards in the pursuit of a common goal. Again, the constraints of organizational roles make the elements somewhat difficult to meet. The literature on
participative decision-making in schools comes closer to a useful definition of collaboration, however, problems emerge there as well.

Shared decision-making, as it has typically been exercised in schools, has been criticized as growing out of a human relations philosophy in which teachers are asked to be involved in decision making in order to increase their satisfaction, loyalty, and acceptance of decisions. However, teachers are not given any real influence over the outcome of decisions because they are not seen as having a valuable contribution to make (Bartunek & Keys, 1979; Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1988; Duke, Showers, & Imber, 1980). This might be called contrived collaboration. Recent calls for collaboration seem to be pressing for a more genuine sharing of decision making authority, where principals and teachers make decisions jointly. This moves in the direction of the human resources philosophy of management that sees teachers as having valuable knowledge and insights to contribute to decisions. Higher quality decisions are the goal of this more genuine form of collaboration in which teachers, parents, and students have actual influence over the outcome of decisions. Developing an instrument that would discern the differences between contrived and genuine collaboration was no small challenge.

The approach initially taken in this study was to ask teachers to rate both their perceived level of involvement and their level of influence separately in a variety of decision domains. This approach proved difficult in the pilot study because it was hard to tell when teachers rated involvement and influence as the same if they were actually making two separate judgments or in an effort-saving move were using the same answer to count for both. A new approach was taken in the full study. Principals were asked to rate the level of
involvement in a school, while teachers were asked to rate their perceived level of influence. The latter approach had some pitfalls as well, in that principals may have been influenced by a sense of social desirability to indicate greater involvement than was actually the case (even though confidentiality had been assured).

Despite these potential measurement difficulties, some interesting findings emerged. The principals’ rating of the level of involvement in decision making had no statistically significant relationship to the level of perceived influence among the teachers. Whether or not teacher or parent committees existed in which various decision domains were taken up, the teachers did not necessarily perceive that either they or the parents had any real influence over the decisions. This supports the complaints in previous literature that most participatory decision structures in school are contrived (Bartunek & Keys, 1979; Bacharach, Bauer, & Shedd, 1988; Duke, Showers, & Imber, 1980). The Hoy and Tarter (1995) model of shared decision making suggests that principals must trust their faculty before they will be willing to engage in a collaborative process in which they share authority and have the same vote as every other member of the committee. When trust is absent, Hoy and Tarter’s model recommends that principals maintain final decision authority. That is, it seems, the pattern most prevalent in the schools in this study.

The hypotheses that guided this study predicted that the level of trust in a school would be related to the level for collaboration. Specifically, each of the four referents of trust-- principal, colleagues, parents, and students-- would be related to the corresponding level of collaboration. Testing the hypotheses concerning trust in parents and trust in students became complicated when those two levels of trust merged to form one factor. Because the
resulting factor, Trust in Clients, had a high reliability (alpha = .97), it was assumed that the new factor effectively captured both levels of trust. Consequently, the two hypotheses concerning trust in parents and trust in students were tested using this one trust factor.

The hypothesis that the level of collaboration with the principal in school-level decisions was related to the level of trust in the principal was supported. This is not to say that the collaboration caused the trust nor that the trust caused the collaboration, simply that they were related. Likewise, a statistically significant relationship was found between the level of collaboration with parents on school-level decisions and the level of trust in clients. In a multiple regression analysis, when all three trust variables were simultaneously regressed on collaboration with the principal, only trust in clients made an independent, significant contribution. Trust in clients also was the only variable that had an independent effect on collaboration with parents. Schools where there was a high level of trust in parents and students could be predicted to be schools where there would be a high level of collaboration on school-level decisions, both between the principal and the faculty, and between the principal and parents.

The level of collaboration with colleagues in classroom-level decisions was not related to the level of trust among the faculty, nor was the level of collaboration with students related to the level of trust in clients. Although principals are asked to share their decision making authority, it may be that teachers were reluctant to share this authority for classroom-level decisions. Perhaps a faculty could have a high level of trust and little joint planning and shared decisions. Conversely, it may be that when a faculty attempts to work
closely together, maintaining trusting relationships becomes more difficult because of the increased opportunities for conflict.

Not surprisingly, the multiple regression analysis again found no significant independent contribution of trust in colleagues in the level of collaboration with colleagues. However, the level of trust in the principal and the level of trust in clients both made significant, independent contributions to the prediction of the level of collaboration with colleagues. Data from the qualitative study shed some light on these perplexing findings.

In interviews, teachers revealed that they held two sets of expectations or two judgments of trust in their colleagues – professional trust and personal trust. Personal trust had the five elements of trust represented in a fairly straightforward way. Professional trust, however, was complicated by difference in teaching style and philosophy, by judgments of the level of commitment and reliability in fulfilling one’s duty to children, and a reluctance to make judgments about one another’s competence perhaps in keeping with the norm of equal status within the teaching profession (Ashton, Webb, & Doda, 1983; Little, 1990). It is unclear whether the trust measure developed in this study primarily tapped personal trust or professional trust, and whether these two different trust judgments have a differential impact on relationships of collaboration. Whether teachers collaborate over classroom-level decisions may also be related to how the school is structured and not be something teachers have control over. The choice to collaborate with colleagues may also be related to teachers’ perceptions of shared philosophy; where philosophies differ teachers may avoid collaborating, even with teachers whom they trust. Teachers in self-contained classrooms
without any provisions for joint planning time or support for shared work may not invest the energy in inventing those structures, no matter how much they trust their colleagues.

The hypothesis that trust in students would be related to collaboration with students was not supported. In fact, collaboration with students was not significantly related to any of the trust variables. Perhaps whether teachers included students in making classroom-level decisions may be as much a matter of pedagogy as trust. Teachers may not choose to allow elementary school students to have a say in classroom rules and activities even when they have a high trust in the students. In situations of low trust in students, teachers may give students a voice as a tactic to win their cooperation.

Regardless of teachers’ willingness to collaborate with students, teachers trust in students and parents was powerfully related to the level of collaboration in schools. Trust in clients had significant independent effect on three of the collaboration variables—collaboration with the principal, and with parents on school-level decisions, and collaboration with colleagues on classroom-level decisions. When students could be counted on to respect the systems and structures of school, and when parents could be trusted to engage constructively with teachers, a greater climate of openness in decision making was also evident. Perhaps there was less defensiveness on the part of the principal and the faculty. Perhaps a greater sense of benevolence, reliability, and competence on the part of parents produced greater willingness to share authority on the part of principals and teachers. Perhaps with a greater sense of shared purposes there was more room at the decision-making table.
Communication

When interacting with a distrusted person, especially if that person holds more power within an organizational hierarchy, the goal of communication often becomes the protection of one’s interest and the reduction of one’s anxiety, rather than the accurate transmission of ideas (Bartolme, 1989; Mellinger, 1956). A person may feel compelled to be evasive or to distort attitudes or information in communicating with a distrusted person. In schools where trust was high, teachers in high-trust schools described rich networks of communication. Communication flowed freely and teachers functioned as an early warning system, making the principal aware of problems while they were still small.

Principals in high-trust schools facilitated communication through their availability. High trust principals were not confined to their offices but made themselves a visible part of the school community. In one high-trust school the principal briefly visited every classroom between 9:00 and 9:30 every morning. The same principal was also on the playground during noon recess, getting to know and to be known by the students, and taking action to prevent student altercations rather that face a pile of students behavior slips in her office at the end of lunch.

Teachers in high-trust schools also reported more frequent and more positive communication with parents than that found in low-trust schools. One principal insisted her faculty make at least one positive contact with parents before any problem-solving calls could be made. When wiring every classroom for telephone service proved unfeasible, this principal invested in portable telephones. Students soon realized that their parents could easily be brought into almost any conversation with their teacher and consequently had less
of a tendency to try to play one against the other. Students had also been made a part of the quarterly progress conference with parents and teachers so that the student was the direct recipient of any praise to be awarded but was also at the center of any problem-solving efforts that emerged.

In contrast, teachers in low-trust schools described constrained communication networks. Where trust was low teachers avoided making contact with the principal, making it difficult for him or her to gain the information needed to be proactive. Teachers in both low-trust schools described discipline that was reactive rather than proactive. Teachers did not feel they could count on the principal as a resource in times of trouble or distress, and in fact, avoided contact lest they be shamed or made an example of in front of the entire faculty. They described very minimal involvement or communication with parents, and what communication existed revolved mostly around problems of student behavior. Not surprisingly, parents did not participate in school programs and rarely even attended parent-teacher conferences.

If communication could be considered the life blood of an organization, schools with low trust were suffering from clogged arteries, hypertension, and the malaise that comes from poor health. Without the proper flow of communication, these schools did not have access to the organizational knowledge and expertise possessed by teachers and parents, and were deprived of the energy, imagination, and vitality more free-flowing communication might bring.
Organizational Citizenship

Organizational citizenship describes instances when a worker spontaneously goes beyond the formally prescribed job requirements and performs non-mandatory behaviors without expectation of receiving explicit recognition or compensation (Deluga, 1994, p. 316). Organizational citizenship helps promote organizational effectiveness in organizations like schools, where formal job descriptions can, at best, delineate broad parameters of the expectations of teachers’ responsibilities. Organizational citizenship behaviors include altruism and courtesy as well as conscientiousness, sportsmanship and civic virtue. Altruism refers to voluntary behaviors that assist a specific individual with a given problem whereas courtesy includes behaviors directed at the prevention of future problems. Conscientiousness is characterized by behaviors that go beyond minimal job requirements, while sportsmanship describes employees who amiably tolerate annoyances that are an inevitable part of any employment setting. Civic virtue has to do with involvement in the political life of the organization (Organ, 1988; Deluga, 1994).

It was evident that the level of organizational citizenship was lower in the schools where trust was low. A causal link cannot be inferred-- it cannot be determined whether lower trust caused poor organizational citizenship or whether the poor citizenship lead to lower trust. Most likely it was a reciprocal process where poor citizenship led to lower trust and lower trust led to poorer citizenship. The teachers in the low-trust schools struggled with how to maintain their own dedication and commitment in an atmosphere that did not support that effort. Some carried on with an individual sense of purpose but felt engulfed by the apathy and overwhelming problems around them. Others were disappointed to watch as their
own sense of responsibility or moral commitment began to slip. Some isolated themselves in their own classrooms, preferring even to eat lunch alone rather than to listen to the negative chatter in the teachers’ lounge.

In low-trust schools, not only did teachers see their colleagues doing the minimum that was expected of them, they also did the minimum they could get away with. Teachers told of colleagues who regularly arrived at or even after the tardy bell, and who walked straight to the parking lot to go home after putting their students on the bus. This took place despite a policy saying that teachers were to report to school one half hour before students arrived, and to stay one half hour after they left at the end of the day. Teachers reported aids who refused to do the work that was assigned to them, or who ate the treats that had been prepared for students. One teacher even told of a veteran teacher in her building who watched soap operas every afternoon while the class was assigned seat work!

In high-trust schools the level of organizational citizenship was very different. There was a strong sense of caring for one another. Teachers were pleased to tell about the ways that they responded when one of their colleagues had a need, from covering one another’s classrooms in an emergency to taking up a Christmas collection for an aid who was facing financial difficulty. People took meals to families in the wake of a death, and even contributed their sick days so that a seriously ill faculty member could continue to stay out and recover. Teachers in these schools worked extremely hard and were proud to meet the high expectations their principals held for them.

The link between trust and organizational citizenship in schools is one that deserves further exploration. Whether trust leads to organizational citizenship or citizenship leads to
trust, it is clear that schools cannot meet the new challenges being demanded of them without faculty members who are good organizational citizens.

Proliferation of Rules

When trust breaks down, organizations are faced with deciding how to respond. Very often they respond with the institution of rules to serve as a substitute for trust (Sitkin & Stickel, 1996). In organizations like schools where a certain amount of discretion is required for people to do their jobs, the proliferation of rules can get in the way of organizational effectiveness. A proliferation of rules can have unintended dysfunctional consequences, making it harder rather than easier for the organization to fulfill its mission.

Where trust was low, there was evidence that rules were being used as a substitute for trust, with a reliance on the teachers contract and a strict interpretation of district policies. The principal in a school where trust had broken down turned to the imposition of rules to reassert her authority and to try to bring her faculty into compliance with her desires for the school. The teachers, however, resented the tactic and saw it as an assault on their professional status. They became less rather than more willing to cooperate with the principal on her agenda. The resulting power struggle did not bode well for the creation of a productive school program.

In high-trust schools there was a strong sense of accountability but there was also more flexibility and leniency for the vagaries of living. When there was a sense of confidence that teachers were working hard and going beyond their minimum commitments, there was a greater willingness to make allowances for teachers. For example, a teacher might be dismissed early to see his or her own child’s school program or to take a sick child to the doctor. Teachers responded by making sure they were worthy of the trust placed in them. They described a sense of urgency to get back after an illness knowing their absence
was placing a burden on colleagues. Instead of minimum compliance they went beyond the requirements of their contract and district policies.

Rules are a necessary part of organizational life. However, in an atmosphere low in trust, rules may be used in ways that impair the organization’s effectiveness. A lack of flexibility in the application of rules could have detrimental effects on teacher loyalty, satisfaction and morale. A proliferation of rules can have dysfunctional consequences for schools.

Directions for Future Research

This study is only a beginning. It builds on four decade of empirical research on trust and attempts to apply them to the challenges faced by schools. It also continues the work of Hoy and his colleagues on trust in schools (1985, 1988, 1989, 1992, 1994, 1995, 1996, 1997, 1998). In this study qualitative data dove-tailed with quantitative findings to provide insight into the elements of trust as well as to explore the dynamics of trust as they are played out in four levels of relationships in schools. Further research is needed to confirm these findings.

This study found a strong empirical support for the five-dimensional model of trust proposed. Results of both the quantitative and qualitative phases of this study found that judgments about benevoience, reliability, competence, honesty, and openness were elements in the trust judgments teachers made in their principals, colleagues, and clients. Further testing of this model is needed.

1. How will the dimensions and dynamics of trust be different in more homogenous or affluent communities?
2. Will trust in students merge with trust in parents as closely in studies at the middle school and secondary school levels?

3. Will the five-dimensional model of trust hold in cross-cultural studies or are these dimensions of trust specific to North American or western culture?

4. What are the consequences of the level of student trust in teachers and in the principal?

5. What differences does it make when students trust or distrust one another?

The qualitative phase of this study revealed interesting findings into the dynamic nature of trust—how trust is developed, what incidents can lead to its decline, and how broken trust can be repaired. The impact of social context and third-party gossip on trust relationships was explored, as well as the implications for trust when people occupy different positions within the hierarchical relationships of an organization. Greater understanding of the dynamic nature of trust is needed.

6. How is trust fostered when a new principal or superintendent enters a school setting?

7. How is trust linked to leader effectiveness? Attention to issues of trust has the potential to impact school leaders’ performance and the length of their tenure.

8. What strategies do expert principals employ for establishing trust with a new faculty?

9. What impact does the existing level of trust in a building make on the decisions and strategies of a new principal coming into that building? What is the impact on new faculty members?

10. In what ways does the level of trusting and collaborative relationships impact the developing sense of competence of novice teachers?
11. What interventions can be made to interrupt the spiral of distrust once it has taken hold at a school?

The relationship of trust to four social processes — collaboration, communication, organizational citizenship, and the proliferation of rules— were explored in this study. The relationship between trust and collaboration was explored in the greatest depth, utilizing both quantitative and qualitative methods. This study attempted to clarify the difference between contrived and genuine collaboration by distinguishing between involvement and influence. Other strategies might be attempted to clarify the meaning of collaboration within schools and to find effective means of measuring it. The qualitative data in this study provides a tentative beginning in the exploration of other social processes. Further exploration of the relationship of trust to the processes of communication, citizenship, and rules seems likely to be fruitful.

12. To what extent does faculty trust promote organizational citizenship? Which elements of trust are most important in this regard?

13. How is faculty trust related to open and undistorted communication?

14. What are the dysfunctional consequences when a low level of trust leads to a proliferation of rules?

The relationship of trust to other constructs in the context of schools would be useful to study as well.

15. What is the relationship of trust in clients to a teacher’s pupil control ideology (Willower, Eidell, & Hoy,1967)? Do trusting teachers tend to be more humanistic in
their orientation? When trust in clients is low, do teachers tend to resort to a more custodial orientation?

16. How is trust in colleagues and trust in the principal related to a teacher’s sense of efficacy (Tschannen-Moran, Woolfolk Hoy, & Hoy, 1998) or the sense of collective efficacy in a school (Goddard, 1998)?

17. How is the level of trust in a school related to student achievement? Will the relationship found between trust and achievement found at the elementary level (Hoy, Tarter, & Witkoskie, 1992) hold for middle and secondary schools?

18. Is there a relationship between the level of trust in a school building and the level of academic press? In what ways is the level of trust in a school related to the level of parent involvement and environmental press (Hoy, Hannum, & Tschannen-Moran, 1998)?

There is a need for greater understanding of trust and its dimensions and dynamics at all levels of the school organization. Understanding trust dynamics in the linkages between organizational levels is especially important: between boards and superintendents, between superintendents and principals, between principals and teachers, between teachers and students, and between parents and schools. Understanding trust within organizational levels is also important. Quantitative studies can be used to explore the various dimensions of trust and their relationship to other constructs across a large number of settings. Qualitative studies are helpful in exploring the dynamic nature of trust within particular school buildings. These and other questions concerning how trust functions in the context of schools are important as schools struggle to rise to the challenge of a changed and changing world.
Conclusion

This is only a beginning, but it is an exciting beginning. This study builds on previous research relating trust to the health and openness of a school’s climate (Hoffman, Sabo, Bliss, & Hoy, 1994; Hoy, Hoffman, Sabo, & Bliss, 1996; Hoy, Sabo, & Barnes, 1996; Tarter, Bliss & Hoy, 1989; Tarter, Sabo, & Hoy, 1995), to school effectiveness (Hoy, Tarter & Witkoskie, 1992; Tarter, Sabo, & Hoy, 1995), and to student achievement (Hoy, Tarter, & Witkoskie, 1992). Findings in this study suggest that trust is related to the level of collaboration with teachers and with parents on school-level decisions. It also suggests that the level of faculty trust in students and parents plays a powerful role in the overall level of collaboration within a school.

The quality and frequency of communication, was positively related to the level of trust in a school building. The organizational citizenship of faculty or the willingness to go beyond the minimum requirements of the one’s job description was also related to the level of trust in a school. The ability of a school to avoid the dysfunctional consequences of a proliferation of rules is another positive benefit derived by schools where trust is high.

Some of the findings of this study were surprising. It was not anticipated that faculty trust in students and parents would be so closely related as to be statistically indistinguishable. It was surprising that the level of involvement in decision making reported by the principals would be statistically unrelated to the level of influence reported by the faculty. And it was a surprise that neither the racial composition of a student body nor the level of transience were important determinants of faculty trust in students and parents. Of the demographic factors studied, the economic class of students was by far the most
important determinant of trust in students and parents. These intriguing findings invite further study.

The study of trust in schools promises to pay useful dividends. If research can provide insights that help school personnel create more trusting environments in schools, more productive schools are likely to be the result. Much work remains to be done, but a construct that is related so powerfully to the productivity of school relationships is worth looking into.
APPENDIX A

Interview Protocol
## Interview Protocol

### TRUST

#### Trust in other teachers

In general how would you describe the quality of interpersonal relationships in this building?

Do the teachers trust each other? Why or why not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benevolence</th>
<th>Do teachers in this school pretty much look out for themselves, or can you count on them to act in your best interest or the best interest of the students?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>In what ways can you count on teachers to be able to do what they’re suppose to do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliability</td>
<td>Can you rely on the teachers in this building to keep their word and live up to the commitments or promises they’ve made? Why or why not?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness</td>
<td>How does information get shared? Are teachers open about the information they receive?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gossip</td>
<td>When information gets passed around the grapevine does it tend to get distorted? How does gossip serve to increase or decrease trust?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingroup</td>
<td>Is trust pretty even among all of the teachers or is there a group of teachers you feel greater trust with? Why? In what ways are you similar to those teachers? different?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup</td>
<td>Is there a group of teachers you feel less trust with? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Think of a teacher you trust. How long have you worked with that person? How did trust develop? Did it develop quickly, or slowly over time? What factors were important in building that trust? Was there a time when you didn’t trust that person? How was trust repaired?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distrust</td>
<td>Think of a teacher you do not trust. What factors have led to that distrust? Was there a time when you did feel greater trust with that person? (Broken social order/broken identity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenge</td>
<td>What happened when trust was broken? How did you react? What did you do or want to do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair</td>
<td>Has there been any attempt to rebuild trust? Can you think of an incident in school in which trust was broken and then it was rebuilt? Can you describe that process? (No repair, unreasonable, reasonable or no conditions)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Trust in the Principal

Do you trust your principal? Why or why not? What factors have led to that feeling?

Is he or she competent? Reliable? Concerned? Open? Which are most important?

Is it important to have a principal you can trust? Why?

Are gender, race or ethnicity factors in your level of trust?

Do you think your principal trusts the teachers? In what ways does the principal show trust in the teachers?

How does the principal display distrust in the teachers? What are the consequences of distrust?

Do teachers spend a lot of energy monitoring what the principal and other teachers are up to?

Can you think of an opportunity that was lost because of the suspiciousness of one another?

#### Trust in Students

In deciding how much you can trust a particular student what factors are most important?

In general has your experience led you to feel that you can count on the students in your school to tell the truth and to come to tell you when they know things you should know?

Would you say the students in your school are reliable? Can you predict how they will behave?

Do the students in this school show concern for one another? Or are they more concerned with what is best for themselves?

#### Trust in Parents

What factors are most important in establishing a trusting relationship with parents?

Is there open communication between teachers and parents or are one or both sides guarded?

Can you count on parents to be concerned for the general welfare of the school or are they mainly motivated by self-interest.

Are the parents in this school reliable? Can you count on them to do what they say they will?
COLLABORATIVE DECISION PROCESSES

Shared Decision Making
What structures exist for teachers to have a voice in decisions about the school?
Are teachers acting in an advisory capacity or are the actual decisions made in these meetings?
Does the participation of teachers affect the outcome of decisions? Do they have influence?
What are the kinds of decisions teachers are involved in: curriculum, policies, discipline,
scheduling, budget, hiring, school improvement, professional development, etc.?
In what ways are you included in decision making or allowed to make decisions that affect you? Is
it through a representative or do you have direct involvement?
Are there decisions you would want to have a voice in that you do not? What are those?

Collaboration between teachers
How much autonomy do you have in decisions that affect your classroom?
In what ways do teachers in your school collaborate with other teachers? Do you collaborate on
curriculum? On discipline? On school-wide projects or events? What else?
To what extent is what you do in your classroom affected by the involvement of other teachers?
Would you prefer more or less involvement with other teachers?
What are factors that make working together difficult? Rewarding?
Do you collaborate with other teachers in the district? In what ways?

Parent involvement in school decision making
What kinds of structures exist to involve parent in decisions affecting the school?
What is the level of involvement of parents?
How much influence do parents have in decisions affecting the school?
What kinds of decisions are parents involved in?

Student involvement in classroom decision making
To what extent are students generally involved in setting classroom rules and consequences?
How much do teachers consult students in developing curriculum units or projects?
To what extent do teachers in this school use cooperative learning techniques?
How do teachers feel about student involvement in classroom decision making?
APPENDIX B

Directions for Introducing Interview
Social Processes Interview Introduction

Hello, I’m Megan Tschannen-Moran. I am a doctoral student in educational administration at The Ohio State University. Thank you for agreeing to talk with me about the social processes in your school. I am interviewing about a dozen teachers in this district as part of my dissertation research. I am interested in exploring how the quality of the interpersonal relationships in a school impacts the decision making and effectiveness of the school. I hope that my work will provide greater understanding of the importance of positive interpersonal relationships in schools.

I would like to tape record our conversation but if you would prefer that we did not I will just work from notes. My main purpose for tape recording is to be as accurate as possible. Your responses will be kept strictly confidential. The tapes and transcripts will be kept in a locked cabinet and destroyed within a year. And they will be labeled and reported using pseudonyms.

Do you mind if I tape?
Would you like to choose your own pseudonym?

I expect the interview to take about an hour. If any of the questions make you uncomfortable or for any reason you don’t want to answer a particular question just say "pass" and we will go on to the next question. If at any point you want to terminate the interview you may.

Do you have any questions about the procedures?

If not, then I would like to ask you to sign this consent form. This says that I have explained the procedures to you and that you are willing to participate. It also provides protection for you so that if I were violate any of the commitments I have made to you, you would know how to track me down. There is a copy for you to keep.

Okay, let’s get started.
APPENDIX C

Interview Consent Form
Consent for Participation in Social and Behavioral Research

I consent to participating in research entitled

A Study of Social Processes in Schools

Wayne Hoy or his authorized representative has explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my participation. Possible benefits of the study have been described as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available.

I acknowledge that I have has the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that I am free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me.

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date:__________________________
Signed: __________________________
(Participant)

Signed: __________________________
(Principal Investigator or his Authorized Representative)

Witness:__________________________
APPENDIX D

Coding Scheme for Qualitative Data
Qualitative Data Coding Scheme

(1) Teacher Perceptions
   (1 1) Principal
      (1 1 1) Trust
         (1 1 1 1) Benevolence, Concern
         (1 1 1 2) Competence
         (1 1 1 3) Reliability
         (1 1 1 4) Integrity, Honesty
         (1 1 1 5) Openness
      (1 1 1 6) History, Familiarity
         (1 1 1 6 1) Breach
         (1 1 1 6 2) Repair
         (1 1 1 6 3) Revenge
         (1 1 1 6 4) Mobility
      (1 1 1 7) Ingroup Dynamics
      (1 1 1 8) Diversity
         (1 1 1 8 1) Race
         (1 1 1 8 2) Gender
   (1 1 2) Collaboration, Decision Making
   (1 1 3) Efficacy

(1 2) Colleagues
   (1 2 1) Trust
      (1 2 1 1) Benevolence, Concern
      (1 2 1 2) Competence
      (1 2 1 3) Reliability
      (1 2 1 4) Integrity, Honesty
      (1 2 1 5) Openness
      (1 2 1 6) History, Familiarity
         (1 2 1 6 1) Breach
         (1 2 1 6 2) Repair
         (1 2 1 6 3) Sanctions, Revenge
         (1 2 1 6 4) Mobility
      (1 2 1 7) Ingroup Dynamics
         (1 2 1 7 1) Outgroup dynamics
      (1 2 1 8) Diversity
         (1 2 1 8 1) Race
         (1 2 1 8 2) Gender
   (1 2 2) Collaboration
      (1 2 2 1) Isolation
      (1 2 2 2) Support
      (1 2 2 3) Committees
   (1 2 3) Efficacy
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(1.3) Students
(1.3.1) Trust
(1.3.1.1) Concern, Respect
(1.3.1.2) Competence
(1.3.1.3) Reliability
(1.3.1.4) Honesty
(1.3.1.5) Openness
(1.3.1.6) History, Familiarity
(1.3.1.6.1) Breach
(1.3.1.6.2) Repair
(1.3.1.6.3) Mobility
(1.3.1.7) Ingroup Dynamics
(1.3.1.8) Diversity
(1.3.1.8.1) Race
(1.3.1.8.2) Gender
(1.3.1.8.3) Economic Class
(1.3.2) Collaboration
(1.3.2.1) Cooperative Learning
(1.3.3) Efficacy

(1.4) Parents
(1.4.1) Trust
(1.4.1.1) Concern, Respect
(1.4.1.2) Competence
(1.4.1.3) Reliability
(1.4.1.4) Honesty
(1.4.1.5) Openness
(1.4.1.6) History
(1.4.1.6.1) Breach
(1.4.1.6.2) Repair
(1.4.1.6.3) Mobility
(1.4.1.7) Ingroup Dynamics
(1.4.1.8) Diversity
(1.4.1.8.1) Race
(1.4.1.8.2) Gender
(1.4.1.8.3) Economic Class
(1.4.2) Collaboration
(1.4.3) Efficacy

(1.5) Other Observations
(1.5.1) External Influences
(1.5.1.1) Union
(1.5.2) Stress
(1.5.2.1) Physical Symptoms
(1.5.3) Climate, Morale
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Directions For Administering Social Processes Surveys

Please distribute the questionnaires and pencils. Give ONE questionnaire to each teacher. There are two separate questionnaires, but each teacher should complete one or the other, not both. Please ask the principal to complete the questionnaire printed on yellow paper. Completing these questionnaires should only take about ten minutes.

Please read the following statement to the faculty:

This survey is part of the dissertation research of two graduate students at The Ohio State University. The purpose of this research is to gather information regarding the perceptions of educators about their schools. There are no correct or incorrect answers, the researchers conducting this study are interested only in your frank opinion.

Two separate questionnaires have been distributed, about half the faculty has one, and the other half has the other. Each teacher needs to complete only one or the other, not both.

This research has been approved by the research committee of the district, including a representative from the union. Data gathered about the school will be completely confidential. Strict procedures to insure the confidentiality of all participants has been approved by the Human Subjects Review Board at the university. All teachers’ responses are anonymous. Data will be compiled at the school level and will be used for a statistical analysis of the relationships between the variables. No individual school scores will be reported. You may skip any item that you feel uncomfortable answering.

Your time, insights, and perceptions are valuable resources. Thank you for sharing them with us!

After the teachers are finished or nearly finished please distribute the chocolate kisses, or put them where the teachers can help themselves. (Not before, so we are not accused of skewing our results with bribery!) Again express our appreciation.

The teachers may keep the pencils– they are an itty-bitty token of our appreciation. :)

When you have all the completed questionnaires, please put them back in the envelope they came in, and return them to us. Please be sure you have included the principal’s questionnaire.

If you have any questions call Megan Tschannen-Moran or Roger Goddard at 292-4672 (office) or 231-1741 (Megan’s home) or 459-8416 (Roger’s home).
APPENDIX F

Social Process in Schools Survey
(Trust)
### Social Processes in Schools

Directions: The following are statements about relationships in your school. Indicate the extent to which each statement characterizes the relationships in your school by filling in the bubble that corresponds to your level of agreement with the statement. 1 = Strongly Disagree, 6 = Strongly Agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teachers in this school typically look out for each other.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teachers in this school trust each other.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Teachers in this school believe what students say.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teachers in this school trust their students.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The teachers in this school have faith in the integrity of the principal.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The principal in this school typically acts with the best interests of the teachers in mind.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Teachers in this school believe in each other.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Even in difficult situations, teachers in this school can depend on each other.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The students in this school have to be closely supervised.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The students in this school cheat if they have the chance.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Students here just aren’t motivated to learn.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The quality of school facilities here really facilitates the teaching and learning process.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The opportunities in this community help ensure that these students will learn.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The principal is unresponsive to teachers’ concerns.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. The principal doesn’t tell teachers what’s really going on.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Teachers can count on the parents in this school.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Teachers can believe what parents tell them.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Teachers in this school really believe every child can learn.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Teachers here are confident they will be able to motivate their students.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Teachers in this school have faith in the integrity of their colleagues.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Teachers in this school are suspicious of each other.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Teachers in this school trust the principal.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. The principal of this school does not show concern for the teachers.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Students in this school can be counted on to do their work.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Students are caring toward one another.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Teachers avoid making contact with parents.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Teachers think most of the parents do a good job.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. If a child doesn’t learn something the first time teachers will try another way.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. The lack of instructional materials and supplies in this school makes teaching very difficult.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Teachers in this school do their jobs well.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. When teachers in this school tell you something you can believe it.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Teachers in this school are able to get through to difficult students.</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
<td>[ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]  [ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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33. Teachers in this school have what it takes to get the children to learn.

34. The teachers in this school are suspicious of most of the principal's actions.

35. The principal in this school keeps his or her word.

36. Teachers in this school are open with each other.

37. Teachers in this school don't share much about their lives outside of school.

38. Teachers here are well-prepared to teach the subjects they are assigned to teach.

39. Teachers in this school are skilled in various methods of teaching.

40. Teachers in this school show concern for their students.

41. The students in this school talk freely about their lives outside of school.

42. Parents in this school are reliable in their commitments.

43. Teachers in this school trust the parents.

44. Teachers here don't have the skills needed to produce meaningful student learning.

45. Teachers here need more training to know how to deal with these students.

46. The principal openly shares personal information with teachers.

47. Teachers in this school can rely on the principal.

48. The principal in this school is competent in doing his or her job.

49. Teachers in this school think there are some students that no one can reach.

50. If a child doesn't want to learn teachers here give up on him or her.

51. Students in this school are reliable.

52. Students here are secretive.

53. Teachers here believe students are competent learners.

54. These students come to school ready to learn.

55. Home life provides so many advantages that students here are bound to learn.

56. When I really try, I can get through to most difficult students.

57. Learning is more difficult at this school because students are worried about their safety.

58. Drugs and alcohol abuse in the community make learning difficult for students here.

59. Teachers here fail to reach some students because of poor teaching methods.

60. Teachers in this school do not have the skills to deal with student disciplinary problems.

61. If I really try hard, I can get through to even the most difficult or unmotivated students.

62. If a student did not remember information I gave in a previous lesson, I would know how to increase his/her retention in the next lesson.

63. If one of my students couldn't do a class assignment, I would be able to accurately assess whether the assignment was at the correct level of difficulty.

64. If a student in my class becomes disruptive and noisy, I feel assured that I know some techniques to redirect him/her quickly.

65. If I had a school-aged child, I would feel comfortable putting my own child in most anyone's classroom in the school.
APPENDIX G

School Practices Survey
(Collaboration)
**School Practices**

Directions: Please indicate the level of influence you perceive each of the following groups has over various decision domains.

**Teachers and School Decisions: To what extent do teachers have influence over the outcome of these types of decisions?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Planning school improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Determining how to allocate time (e.g. scheduling)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Determining how to allocate financial resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Determining personnel needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Determining criteria for selecting personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Selecting personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Assigning and reassigning personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Evaluating personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Determining how to allocate space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Designing building modifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parents and School Decisions: To what extent do parents have influence over the outcome of these types of decisions?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. Determining areas in need of improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Planning school improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Determining curriculum priorities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Determining how to allocate resources (e.g. the school budget)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Fostering community relations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Resolving problems with community groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Determining school rules and regulations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Determining how to comply with mandates, legislation, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Approving extracurricular activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Collective Decisions Making With Colleagues: To what extent do teacher committees influence decisions of this kind?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very much</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. Determining school rules</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Determining consequences for rule-breaking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Determining student placement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Determining professional development needs and goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Planning professional development activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Selecting instructional methods and activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Evaluating curriculum and programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Resolving student learning problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Resolving student behavior problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Developing procedures for reporting student progress to parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students in Classroom Decisions: to what extent do students have influence in these decisions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Determining classroom rules</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Determining consequences for classroom rule-breaking</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Selecting curriculum content</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Selecting instructional methods and activities</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Evaluation of student work</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Resolving student behavior problems</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| To what extent do teachers use these cooperative learning methods? |
|---|---|
| 36. Small group learning experiences | Not at all | Very much |
| 37. Small group projects | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 38. Interdependent reward structures for group work | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
| 39. Peer tutoring | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |

Please express your level of agreement with the following statements. 1=strongly disagree, 6=strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40. Teachers in this school have frequent contact with parents.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Parents of students in this school encourage good habits of schooling</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Students neglect to complete homework.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Students make provisions to acquire extra help from teachers.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Students respect others who get good grades.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. The school is vulnerable to outside pressures.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Community demands are accepted even when they are not consistent with the educational program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Students seek extra work so they can get good grades.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Teachers feel pressure from the community.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Teachers are protected from unreasonable community and parental demands.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Students try hard to improve on previous work.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. The learning environment is orderly and serious.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Select citizen groups are influential with the board.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Teachers in this school believe that their students have the ability to achieve academically.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Academically oriented students in this school are ridiculed by their peers</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. The school is open to the whims of the public.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. A few vocal parents can change school policy.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Parent involvement facilitates learning here.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Community involvement facilitates learning here.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Principal Questionnaire

All responses will be held strictly confidential. Results will be reported as relationships between variables, never as the scores of individual schools. You may skip any questions that you are uncomfortable answering.

Teachers and School Decisions: Is there a functioning committee in this school in which teachers are involved in making decisions in the following domains?

1. Planning school improvement
2. Determining how to allocate time (e.g. scheduling)
3. Determining how to allocate financial resources
4. Determining personnel needs
5. Determining criteria for selecting personnel
6. Selecting personnel
7. Assigning and reassigning personnel
8. Evaluating personnel
9. Determining how to allocate space
10. Designing building modifications

Parents and School Decisions: Is there a functioning committee in this school in which parents are involved in making decisions in the following domains?

11. Determining areas in need of improvement
12. Planning school improvement
13. Determining curriculum priorities
14. Determining how to allocate resources (e.g. the school budget)
15. Fostering community relations
16. Resolving problems with community groups
17. Determining school rules and regulations
18. Determining how to comply with mandates, legislation, etc.
19. Approving extracurricular activities

Collective Decision Making Among Teachers: Are there functioning committees in this school in which teachers are involved with one another in making the following kinds of decisions?

20. Determining school rules
21. Determining consequences for rule-breaking
22. Determining student placement
23. Determining professional development needs and goals
24. Planning professional development activities
25. Selecting instructional methods and activities
26. Evaluating curriculum and programs
27. Resolving student learning problems
28. Resolving student behavior problems
29. Developing procedures for reporting student progress to parents

Students in Classroom Decisions: Are students involved in the following decision domains?

30. Determining classroom rules
31. Determining consequences for classroom rule-breaking
32. Selecting curriculum content
33. Selecting instructional methods and activities
34. Evaluation of student work
35. Resolving student behavior problems

Please make corrections if the following information is incorrect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of teachers</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
<th>Percent of students receiving free and reduced priced meals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The literature suggests that transience and diversity are two important factors affecting social processes in schools. Answering the following questions will enable us to explore these issues in further depth.

What is the annual rate of student mobility or turn over?

What is the approximate racial mix of the student body in your school?
- % African American or Black
- % Asian American or Pacific Islander
- % Hispanic or Latino
- % European American
- % Other

What is your gender? female male

What is the mix of your faculty by gender? female male

What is your race?
- African American or Black
- Asian American or Pacific Islander
- Hispanic or Latino
- European American
- Other
APPENDIX I

Trust Items by Level
Faculty Trust in the Principal
1. Teachers in this school trust the principal.
2. The teachers in this school are suspicious of most of the principal’s actions.
3. The teachers in this school have faith in the integrity of the principal.
4. The principal in this school typically acts with the best interests of the teachers in mind.
5. The principal of this school does not show concern for the teachers.
6. The principal in this school is unresponsive to teachers’ concerns.
7. Teachers in this school can rely on the principal.
8. The principal in this school is competent in doing his or her job.
9. The principal in this school keeps his or her word.
10. The principal doesn’t tell teachers what is really going on.
11. The principal openly shares personal information with teachers.

Faculty Trust in Colleagues
1. Teachers in this school trust each other.
2. Teachers in this school typically look out for each other.
3. Teachers in this school are suspicious of each other.
4. Teachers in this school believe in each other.
5. Even in difficult situations, teachers in this school can depend on each other.
6. Teachers in this school are not competent in their teaching responsibilities.
7. Teachers in this school have faith in the integrity of their colleagues.
8. When teachers in this school tell you something you can believe it.
9. Teachers in this school are open with each other.

Faculty Trust in Clients
1. Teachers in this school trust their students.
2. Teachers in this school trust the parents to support them.
3. The students in this school have to be closely supervised.
4. Students are caring toward one another.
5. Students in this school are reliable.
6. Parents in this school are reliable in their commitments.
7. Students in this school can be counted on to do their work.
8. Teachers can count on the parents in this school.
9. Teachers here believe students are competent learners.
10. Teachers think most of the parents do a good job.
11. Teachers in this school believe what students say.
12. Students in this school cheat if they have the chance.
13. Teachers can believe what parents tell them.
14. The students in this school talk freely about their lives outside of school.
15. Students here are secretive.
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