

PREDICTORS
OF
FACULTY TRUST
IN ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS:
ENABLING BUREAUCRACY, TEACHER PROFESSIONALISM,
AND
ACADEMIC PRESS

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for

the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate

School of The Ohio State University

By

Jeffrey R. Geist, M.A.

The Ohio State University

2002

Approved by

Dissertation Committee:

Professor Wayne K. Hoy, Adviser

Professor John Blackburn

Professor Scott R. Sweetland

Professor Franklin B. Walter

Adviser
College of Education

Copyright by
Jeffrey R. Geist
2002

ABSTRACT

Previous research has suggested that trust in schools facilitates collaboration, school health, elementary student achievement, and school effectiveness. The purpose of this study was to investigate predictors of faculty trust in the principal, in colleagues, and in clients (students and parents). Moreover, it was hypothesized that because of a "trust spillover" phenomenon, each of the aspects of faculty trust would be moderately correlated with one another. The sample was composed 146 elementary schools in Ohio. Although data were collected from 4,069 teachers, the unit of analysis was the school. First, factor analysis confirmed the factor structure and construct validity of the trust scales. Then all of the hypotheses were confirmed. Enabling bureaucracy (structure) was positively related with and the best predictor of faculty trust in the principal; teacher professional behavior was positively related with and the best predictor of faculty trust in colleagues; and academic emphasis was positively associated with and the best predictor of faculty trust in clients. Moreover, each of the trust subscales, as expected, was moderately correlated with each other, as were the independent variables. The results also demonstrated that school size had no remarkable effect with any aspect of faculty trust. SES (socioeconomic status) however, was negatively associated with faculty trust in clients and the independent variable, academic emphasis. This result was not unexpected. It should be noted that while this study designated three variables as independent, each of their relationships with faculty trust is most likely bi-directional; that is, the relationships or causality are unclear and probably are reciprocal.

Dedicated to my children,
Mark Jeffrey and Gail Elizabeth

And joyn with thee calm Peace, and Quiet,
Spare Fast, that oft with gods doth diet,
And hears the Muses in a ring
Ay round about Jove's altar sing.
And adde to these retired leasure,
That in trim Gardens takes his pleasure;
But first, and chiefest, with thee bring,
Him that yon soars on golden wing,
Guiding the fiery-wheeled throne,
The Cherub Contemplation,
And the mute Silence hist along.

-John Milton, from "Il Penseroso"

Haste thee, nymph, and bring with thee
Jest and youthful Jollity,
Quips and Cranks, and wanton Wiles,
Nods, and Becks, and Wreathed Smiles,
Such as hang on Hebe's cheek,
And love to live in dimple sleek;
Sport that wrincled Care derides,
And Laughter holding both his sides.
Com, and trip it as you go
On the light fantastick toe,
And in thy right hand lead with thee,
The Mountain Nymph, sweet Liberty.

-John Milton, from "L'Allegro"

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Writing and researching are absorbing activities, and for that very reason, there come difficult and unfortunate times in our lives when it is the best possible activity in which to be engaged. I have nothing but gratitude for Dr. Wayne Hoy for the perspicacity, sensitivity, and concern he expressed by simply providing me the opportunity to pursue this study. He is an excellent educator, a charismatic motivator, and for those who are privileged to work with him, a man who inspires abiding loyalty and respect. I am honored to count him as a friend.

I appreciate Dr. Scott Sweetland for his friendship, wise counsel, and helpful insights. He had completed the journey on which I embarked, and his guidance and direction are deeply appreciated. His scholarship and dedication to work are exemplary.

I am privileged to name Dr. Frank Walter among my committee members. He is an accomplished and widely respected educator, and his frequent encouragement to persist and prevail is appreciated. I enjoyed the conversations we had, and took away from his classroom teachings valuable political insights culled from his many years as state superintendent of Ohio.

When I think of the fine education I received from this university, professors like Dr. John Blackburn come to mind. He is a friend and captivating educator who demands the best from his students. His lectures, discussions, and insights are from the wellspring of an imaginative, organized, and humorous mind. His simple encouragement of “Keep smiling” did me more good than ever he knew.

VITA

July 28, 1956.....Born - Lakewood, Ohio

1978.....B.A. Sociology, The Ohio State University

1978-1994.....Journeyman Printer and Pressman

1997.....M.A. Education, The Ohio State University

1994-1998.....Graphic Communications Teacher,
South-Western City Schools
Grove City, Ohio

1998-1999.....Graduate Research Associate,
The Ohio State University

1999-2000.....K-8 Principal, Amanda-Clearcreek S.D.,
Stoutsville, OH

2000-2002.....Secondary School Administrator, Licking County
Joint Vocational School, Newark, Ohio

2002-present.....Elementary Principal, Lakewood Local S.D.,
Hebron, Ohio

FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: College of Education
Educational Policy and Leadership
Educational Administration

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Abstract.....	ii
Dedication.....	iv
Acknowledgments.....	iv
Vita.....	v
List of Tables.....	ix
 CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION.....	 1
Enabling Bureaucracy.....	4
Academic Press.....	9
Teacher Professional Behavior.....	11
Problem Statement.....	12
Purpose Statement.....	14
Definition of Terms.....	14
Basic Assumptions.....	15
Limitations and Delimitations.....	16
 CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES.....	 17
Trust.....	17
Early Experimental Research.....	17
Motivational orientation.....	20
Elements of cooperation.....	22
The Osgood Proposal.....	23
TIT-for-TAT.....	24
Trust as a Personality Trait.....	25
Trust Research in Corporate Organizations.....	27
The spiral reinforcement model of trust.....	27
Stages of executive trust.....	29
Conditions of interpersonal corporate trust.....	29
The conditions of trust inventory.....	30
Affect and cognition-based trust in organizations.....	31

The Organizational Trust Inventory.....	33
Role-based trust.....	33
The Construct of Trust.....	34
Risk-taking and vulnerability.....	34
Predictability and dependability.....	35
Confidence.....	36
Honesty.....	37
Benevolence.....	37
Competence.....	38
Openness.....	38
Fractured Trust.....	39
Distrust and betrayal.....	39
Revenge.....	45
Reconciliation.....	46
Trust in Schools.....	47
Conclusion.....	50
Bureaucracy.....	50
Max Weber.....	51
Representative, Mock, and Punishment-centered Bureaucracies.....	54
Multidimensional Notions of Bureaucracy.....	56
Hall's approach.....	56
Measures of bureaucracy in schools.....	58
The University of Aston studies.....	59
Enabling Structures.....	60
Conclusion and Implications.....	65
The Press for Academic Achievement.....	66
The Coleman Report.....	66
Parochial Schools and the Common School Effect.....	67
Effective School Research.....	70
Culture and Climate of Effective Schools.....	71
Conclusion and Implications.....	75
Teacher Professional Orientation.....	77
Cosmopolitan vs. Local Orientation.....	79
Upward mobiles, indifferents, and ambivalents.....	81
Professional and Bureaucratic Priorities.....	81
A dual orientation.....	83
Teacher Self-Governance, Expertise, and Autonomy.....	85
Teacher empowerment and professional communities.....	87
Conclusion and Implications.....	88

Theoretical Rationale and Hypotheses.....	90
Conclusion.....	94
CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY.....	96
Sample.....	96
Participants.....	97
Data Collection Procedures.....	97
Variables.....	97
Operational Measures.....	98
Hoy and Tschannen-Moran Trust Survey.....	98
Enabling Bureaucracy.....	100
Teacher Professional Behavior.....	102
Academic Press.....	104
Data Analysis.....	105
Conclusion.....	106
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS AND PRESENTATION OF DATA.....	107
Descriptive Statistics.....	108
Factor Analysis of the Trust Scales.....	108
Subscale Intercorrelations.....	110
Correlations of Demographic Data with Faculty Trust Aspects and Independent Variables.....	114
Multiple Regression Analysis.....	115
Multiple regression analysis with demographic variables.....	118
Conclusion.....	119
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION OF RESULTS.....	120
Summary of Findings.....	121
Discussion.....	124
Enabling bureaucracy and faculty trust in the principal.....	125
Teacher professional behavior and faculty trust in colleagues.....	126
Academic emphasis and faculty trust in clients.....	127
The interplay of demographic variables.....	128
Practical Implications.....	129
Research Implications.....	133
Conclusion.....	135
Appendix A Research Prospectus.....	136
Appendix B Survey Administration Directions.....	141
Bibliography.....	143

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
4.1 Descriptive statistics of research variables and demographic data.....	108
4.2 Factor analysis of the Faculty Trust Scales.....	109
4.3 Correlations among the Faculty Trust Scales.....	112
4.4 Correlations among the independent variables.....	113
4.5 Correlations among the independent and dependent variables.....	114
4.6 Correlations of demographic data with aspects of faculty trust and independent variables.....	115
4.7 Multiple regression of faculty trust.....	118
4.8 Multiple regression of faculty trust with demographic variables.....	119

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Trust is a topic both intriguing and elusive. What is it? How is it established? Once established, how is it maintained? How does one explain and approach broken trust, betrayal, revenge, and reconciliation? In the context of a school, these questions assume additional complexity. Is trust affected by school structure, teacher professionalism, or academic emphasis? If so, at which levels, administrative, colleague, or client?

Faculties in public schools are under scrutiny to raise test scores, reduce dropout rates, engage in professional development, and to a large degree, assume responsibility for each student's academic performance, citizenship, and general safety and welfare. Research suggests that a high level of trust within a school, as perceived by its faculty, is indicative of a school which is healthy, organized, and efficient (Hoy, Tarter, & Witkoskie, 1992), and that faculty trust in principals (Hoffman, Sabo, Bliss, & Hoy, 1994; Hoy & Kupersmith, 1985), colleagues (Hoy, Tarter, & Witkoskie, 1992), and clients (students and parents) (Goddard Tschannen-Moran, & Hoy, 2001; Smith, Hoy, & Sweetland, 2001), are referents which are associated with such diverse constructs as enabling bureaucracy, teacher professionalism, and academic emphasis.

From the literature on trust emerges several descriptions of what trust is, and how and in which human domain to best characterize it. Alpern (1997) delineates the breadth

of the subject by listing several postulates by which trust has been conceptualized, such as an action, attitude, orientation, or relationship. Additionally, he notes that trust has been characterized as either cognitive, affective, or conative; and that it "has been thought to be a rational calculation on available evidence; a leap beyond what reasons support; [or] outside of reasoning altogether" (p. 31). Holmes and Rempel (1989) write that trust reduces uncertainty. Any attempt to define and describe trust precisely should observe the caveat against conflating trust with trustworthiness.

Perhaps it is easiest to think of trust as something given, and trustworthiness as a virtue and the object of trust (Flores & Solomon, 1997). The attribution of being trustworthy, in most instances, is based upon a certain amount of history or evidence, whereas trust can be given (but generally is not) by the trustor to the trustee in the absence of any reason whatsoever. Therefore, it is reasonable to delineate the aspects of trust, and in so doing, both describe and provide indicators why a trustor should give his trust to the trustee. Research suggests that those indicators are risk-taking and vulnerability, predictability and dependability, confidence, honesty, benevolence, competence, and openness. Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) describe trust as "an individual's or group's willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the latter party is benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open" (p. 189).

An examination of trust should include the subject of distrust--its origination and disutility. Baier (1986) said that we notice trust as we notice air, only when it becomes scarce or polluted (p. 234). Sometimes distrust and its attendant patterns of vendetta and vengeance constitute a form of "emotional violence" (Flores & Solomon, 1997, p. 59)

fueled by strong, convoluted passions. Betrayal and distrust are particularly insidious behaviors in an organization because the company or institution's mission and objectives are scuttled on the shoals of self-aggrandizement. Trust is too important an element in today's organizations to be regarded cavalierly; in fact, Dasgupta (1988) views trust as a commodity, and writes, "People invest resources for the purpose of building a reputation of honesty" (p. 70). Cummings and Bromily (1996) as well as Fukuyama (1995) cast employee/employer trust relationships as valuable "social capital" because expenditures for surveillance and monitoring services lessen as trust increases. The organization, in turn, is free to spend this accrued capital on innovation and employee flexibility. Such social capital, or exchanges of trust, extend to transactions and relationships with vendors, competing firms, agencies, and customers. Business is gained or lost upon the perception of trust. Trust lowers economic transaction costs because it reduces episodes of opportunism (Williamson, 1975). Within a business or school, therefore, the understanding that trust is a keystone and that it clearly is advantageous and adds value to the goals and human relationships of the organization should be accepted as axiomatic. Trust must be sought and worked for--its manifestation is neither automatic nor acquired easily--it requires, as a foundation, consistent discipline and restraint against self-interested actions and behavior (Brenkert, 1997). Faculty trust is an important ingredient of the social context of schools; in fact, strong faculty trust in parents and students is a good predictor of elementary school student achievement (Goddard, Tschannen-Moran, & Hoy, 2001).

Enabling Bureaucracy

The term bureaucracy is associated with the notion of hierarchy. It is common practice to denigrate summarily bureaucracies as rigid, inefficient, sclerotic, and rife with inflexible policies and procedures. And yet, rational organizations must assume a bureaucratic structure because two important elements, formalization (formal rules and procedures) and centralization (hierarchy of authority), are pivotal in maintaining order and conducting daily operations. Moreover, research suggests that bureaucracies reduce role conflict and role ambiguity (Jackson & Schuler, 1985; Organ & Greene, 1981; Senatra, 1980).

Jackson and Schuler (1985) found that formalization reduces role ambiguity because it allows members of an organization to grasp clearly their respective tasks and responsibilities. This research also demonstrated that job satisfaction negatively correlates with both role ambiguity and role conflict. Organ and Greene (1981) found that formalization acted as a positive force in bureaucracies; it tended to diminish feelings of alienation. This was accomplished indirectly in that formalization, by way of reducing role ambiguity, strengthened an individual's identification with the organization. "Formalization also acts to reduce role ambiguity and to increase identification with the organization. Both of these relationships reduce alienation..." (p. 245).

Podsakoff, Williams and Todor (1986) found evidence that "the overall effect of organizational formalization on professionals' attitudes is not necessarily detrimental and may, in fact, be constructive" (p. 820). The authors conjectured that organizational formalization added clarity to the employees' understanding of their jobs because of a reduction in role ambiguity; there were procedural certainty and information sufficient to

inform an individual of his role in the bureaucratic structure. Concomitant with a reduction in ambiguity was a reduction in alienation; the overall effect of which was to increase organizational commitment. The prescription of Podsakoff, Williams and Todor (1986) is interesting and counter-intuitive: "...our results suggest that managers and practitioners interested in decreasing alienation among professionals and nonprofessionals alike may judiciously consider the use of additional rules and procedures" (p. 829).

Clearly, bureaucracies are necessary and can be functional. In contrast, a hindering or coercive bureaucracy is marked by deficiencies in the areas of communication, innovation, and trust. Management-labor relationships are characterized by divisiveness, layers of control, autocracy, and insecurity (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001). Elements of formalization and centralization assume an officious and onerous cast in a hindering structure.

Research suggests, however, that it is possible to maintain the internal structure of an organization or school so that it constitutes enabling, rather than coercive tendencies. The *amount* of formalization and centralization is not so important as the *kind* of formalization and centralization. An enabling structure is characterized by decentralized, flexible relationships that encourage problem solving, task mastery, intergroup participation, explicit communication and trust (Adler, 1994; Adler, 1999; Adler & Borys, 1996; Adler, Goldoftas, & Levine, 1998; Hoy & Sweetland, 2000, 2001). An enabling bureaucracy encourages employees to discover "best fit" or "best practices." Problem-solving skills are emphasized as administrators allow employees the freedom to

innovate amidst contingencies, unexpected events, and obstacles that might impede the goals, objectives, and productivity of the organization.

An example of this organizational approach is the production system at NUMMI, a 1983 joint corporate venture between Toyota and General Motors (Adler, 1998). In accordance with the technique of *kanban*, scheduling was performed just-in-time by departments, not computers. *Kaizen*, or continuous improvement, was facilitated by an emphasis on worker training, visual control, participation, and teamwork. The actual manufacturing work was highly formalized (amount), but nevertheless enabling (kind). For instance (Adler, Goldoftas, & Levine, 1998; p. 132):

This practice was, in the words of a NUMMI manager, ‘the intelligent interpretation and application of Taylor’s time and motion studies.’ Each job was analysed down to its constituent gestures, and the sequence of gestures was refined and optimized for maximum performance. Every task was planned in great detail, and each person performed that task identically. Unlike traditional Taylorism, standardized work at NUMMI was conducted not by staff methods engineers--NUMMI had none--but by Team Leaders and Team Members themselves.

Moreover, these standardized production procedures were subject to continuous improvement and refinement in a perennial effort at increasing quality and efficiency. This mixture of highly formalized procedures and an enabling organizational culture was marked by problem-solving, innovation, and “best fit” or “best practice” objectives. At NUMMI, employees modulated between standardized, routine production responsibilities and participative problem-solving activities. Individual and organizational goals were congruent (Adler & Borys, 1996). Employee involvement was an important component of the plant's emphasis on continuous improvement and product quality (Levine, 1995). This identification resulted in motivation and higher levels of productivity.

It is possible for organizational spans of control, even in highly formalized environments, to be infused with trust. For example, *world-class manufacturing* (Schonberger, 1986) is an industrial production model designed to streamline the manufacturing process by replacing costly procedures, such as quality control stations and routine manager reports, with increased worker responsibility and empowerment. For instance, in a conventional managerial control loop, the output of the operator/machine provides data and information which is made available to both quality assurance and production control stations. This data is compared to pre-established standards and then input into the computer network, the results of which are examined by the quality assurance, production control, and accounting departments. Comparisons are scrutinized and any departure from productivity standards subsequently is generated back to the line management and first line supervisors. The conventional control loop is closed as feedback and adjustment directives are provided once again to the operator/machine. Clearly, if one or more of these processes can be eliminated or consolidated, higher levels of efficiency and productivity should result. Consequently, Schonberger (1986) advocated shortening the conventional control loop by providing immediate production reports to the operator/machine. In the event that adjustments were beyond the control of the operator/machine, line supervisors could “bring in operators from other areas, engineers, buyers, suppliers, manufacturing representatives--whoever can help--and form a project team to study and solve the problem” (Schonberger, 1986, p. 187). This model increased operator/machine responsibility by reducing the flow chart to a bi-directional process comprised of two elements: the operator/machine and updated batches of information and data accessible to the manufacturing and production areas. The results

were flexibility, higher levels of worker morale, and employee empowerment in the problem-solving process. Adler postulated a similar method of shortened process control he termed the "usability approach" (Adler, 1999, p. 41), which shifts a measure of control from the engineer to the operator through the incorporation of "glassbox" or internal transparency of machinery and repair procedures. Labor is regarded not as a risk factor that necessitates foolproof design processes, but as valuable intellectual capital and an innovative, flexible, production intervention.

World-class manufacturing and the usability approach are industrial examples that reflect the procedures and structural processes--the formalization and centralization--of an enabling bureaucracy. An enabling bureaucracy can be characterized by a high degree of formalization, but it is not of the coercive or hindering type. In the pursuit of excellence and efficiency, centralization becomes flexible and aligned to discovering solutions by promoting worker participation. To this end, the upper echelon's span of control is modified and replaced with trust, design innovation, and worker autonomy. These organizational interactions should reflect the fact that each member's motivation and behaviors are congruent with the corporate quest for efficiency, quality, and job satisfaction.

It is the expectation of this study that the same formalization and centralization factors, perceptions, and attitudes which research has shown comprise an enabling bureaucracy within the context of business and industry organizations likewise can be practiced with similar success in school buildings and school districts. As described, the theoretical framework is drawn from organizational research in both industry and public

schools. It is predicted that the elementary school hierarchical structure is modifiable and explains, to a significant extent, faculty trust in the principal.

Academic Press

"Quality school administrators lead their schools by transforming their culture into one that emphasizes cooperation, trust, openness, and continuous improvement" (Hoy & Miskel, 1996, p. 237). In today's schools, the quest for academic achievement, quality, and excellence are major challenges confronting administrators, teachers, students, and parents. Over the past two decades, state departments of education have devoted a significant amount of effort and resources to the development and implementation of objective, standards-based academic achievement strategies and measures such as proficiency and diagnostic tests, teacher certification and licensure requirements, state report cards, and intervention programs.

Building on the foundation of Parson's (1960) social system functions, Hoy and Miskel (1982) adopted an integrated goal/system-resource model to conceptualize four school properties indicative of effectiveness: organizational commitment, organizational productivity, organizational cohesiveness, and organizational adaptation. These properties were operationalized in two studies so that research data could be garnered from teachers, administrators, and students (Hoy & Ferguson, 1985; Hoy & Miskel, 1982). Subsequent researchers borrowed this integrated model of school effectiveness and wove it into a conceptual framework to uncover some underlying dimensions related to student achievement and academic emphasis in urban elementary schools (Uline, Miller, & Tschannen-Moran, 1998). They found that higher levels of faculty trust in colleagues and the principal were positively correlated with student achievement when

compared with state standardized reading, math, and writing scores. Both referents of faculty trust also were correlated with school effectiveness as perceived by the teachers. Similar studies underscore the role of trust and its significant correspondence with school effectiveness (Goddard, Tschannen-Moran, & Hoy, 2001; Hoy & Kupersmith, 1985; Hoy, Sabo, & Barnes, 1996; Hoy, Tarter, & Witkoskie, 1992).

For the purposes of this study, academic emphasis will be approached as "the extent to which the school is driven by a quest for academic excellence" (Goddard, Sweetland, & Hoy, 2000). It also has been expressed as "the learning imperative" (Beck & Murphy, 1996). Research suggests that higher levels of academic press, or emphasis, are significantly related to higher levels of student achievement (Hoy & Sabo, 1998; Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991). Other writers have underscored the influential role that parents play in academic achievement of their children (Henderson & Berla, 1997; Murphy et al., 2000). A recent study which measured, among other variables, academic emphasis and faculty trust, incorporated within several survey questions the following two items, "parents exert pressure to maintain high standards" and "parents press for school improvement" (Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2000). They found that faculty trust in students and parents "were not separate aspects of trust, but instead combined to form a single unitary" factor of trust (Smith, Hoy, & Sweetland, 2001, p. 135). In this study, therefore, given past studies and a theoretical base, it seems plausible to investigate to what extent academic press is an indicator or associated with faculty trust in clients (students and parents).

Teacher Professional Behavior

The mantle of professional authority is bestowed upon occupations according to the following general criteria: a foundation of technology, exclusive jurisdiction, a standard of extensive training and education, and trustworthiness (Wilensky, 1964). Many occupations aspire to this status, but owing to deficiencies in one or more criterion, the public's acknowledgement as to the aspirant's status is not forthcoming, and claims to prestige and professionalism are summarily disregarded. Duty attaches itself to the professional's stature and privilege; he is guided by a code of ethics from which he is expected to conduct his practice with freedom, autonomy, competence, responsibility, and for the betterment of his fellow man.

In large organizations, bureaucratic characteristics such as hierarchy, span of control, and formalization have the effect of impinging on the autonomous traits, loyalties, and behaviors of the professional. Organizational values tend to conflict with professional values. A bureaucratic structure emphasizes disciplined compliance and loyalty, while the professional is an expert accustomed to a large amount of freedom in which to conduct his work. His loyalties may be divided between the organization and outside colleagues, associations, and reference groups from which he derives knowledge, fruitful exchanges, and camaraderie. This incongruence is described by several researchers (Blau & Scott, 1962; Gouldner, 1962; Hoy & Miskel, 1996; Reissman, 1947) from whose writings have emerged ideas and terms such as functional bureaucrat, local and cosmopolitan orientations, and professional/bureaucratic conflict.

The essential question to resolve is how can a professional exercise all the concomitant advantages of his status--expertise, technical knowledge, competence, extra-organizational collaboration, and ongoing training--in a structure that is composed of multiple layers of authority, objective rules and policies, and in whose culture the overarching values are stability, loyalty, predictability, and compliance? The resolution of this quandary is germane to the education profession as teachers clamor for professional status against a backdrop of educational reform demands and mandates.

Public insistence for educational excellence argues for teachers assuming, practicing, and enjoying a more professional orientation; yet in many schools obstacles remain such as autocratic structural conditions, lack of time to collaborate, inflexible curriculum and teaching roles (Kruse, Louis, & Bryk, 1995), rigid centralization, lack of community interaction (Kruse, Louis, & Bryk, 1995; Murphy et al., 2001), and lack of opportunities to update knowledge and skills.

Recent research suggests that higher levels of teacher professional behavior are associated with a faculty that trusts one another (Hoy, Hannum, & Tschannen-Moran, 1998; Smith, Hoy, & Sweetland, 2001). These findings provide the context for investigating further the relationship between teacher professional orientation and faculty trust in colleagues.

Problem Statement

Public elementary schools are harried places peopled by teachers who have assumed the responsibility of providing our youngest students with those rudimentary, essential skills crucial to future scholastic success. A faculty that exhibits collective trust is more apt to solve problems, clarify goals, exchange accurate information, explore a

wider array of possibilities, and demonstrate greater commitment and social cohesion than low-trust groups (Zand, 1997). In short, trust is preferable to distrust because it allows for reduced transaction costs and efficiency (Williamson, 1975). Additionally, faculty trust in colleagues has been linked to school effectiveness (Hoy, Tarter, & Witkoskie, 1992), as has faculty trust in clients (Goddard, Tschannen-Moran, & Hoy, 2001), and faculty trust in the principal (Tarter, Sabo, & Hoy, 1995). Moreover, all three dimensions of faculty trust correlate moderately with one another (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999).

Research on faculty trust within the context of elementary schools is scant, and studies which investigate the factors of academic press, enabling bureaucracy, and teacher professional behavior are equally rare. Two recent high school studies have shown a relationship between academic press and faculty trust in clients (Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2000; Smith, Hoy, & Sweetland, 2001), and there are two high school studies which investigate and develop enabling bureaucracy into a useful construct and link it with faculty trust in colleagues (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000), and faculty trust in the principal (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001). Particularly non-existent is a consideration of a combination of potential predictors such as enabling bureaucracy, professional teacher behavior, and academic press. In an attempt to fill the breach, this study investigates these factors against all three trust referents: faculty trust in the principal, faculty trust in colleagues, and faculty trust in clients.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study is to investigate how teacher trust in three areas--principal, colleagues, and clients--relates to the level of enabling bureaucracy, teacher professional behavior, and academic press in elementary schools.

Research Questions

Question 1: Are the three aspects of faculty trust related to each other?

Question 2: Are the variables enabling bureaucracy, professional teacher behavior, and academic press related to each other?

Question 3: To what extent are structure, professionalism, and academic press related to each aspect of trust?

Question 4: What is the best predictor of each aspect of faculty trust?

Question 5: Is each aspect of trust predicted by a different pattern of independent variables?

At the culmination of the literature review in the next chapter these questions will be addressed and recast as a set of research hypotheses which will provide direction to the empirical portion of this study.

Definition of Terms

In order to assist the reader's understanding of the concepts and research which appear in this study, a definition of terms is provided.

Academic Emphasis: "The extent to which the school is driven by a quest for academic excellence" (Hoy, Tarter, & Kottcamp, 1991, p. 71).

Academic Press: "Teachers setting high but reasonable goals, students responding positively to the challenge of these goals, and the principal supplying the resources and exerting influence to attain these learning goals" (Sweetland & Hoy, 2000, p. 709).

Enabling Bureaucracy: "A hierarchical authority structure that helps rather than hinders [and constitutes] a system of rules and regulations that guides problem solving" (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000).

Hindering Bureaucracy: "A hierarchical authority structure that hinders and a system of rules and regulations that is coercive. The hierarchy has as its basic mission controlled and disciplined compliance of workers" (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000).

Professional Orientation (Professional Teacher Behavior): An orientation which reflects behavior such as "respect for colleague competence, commitment to students, autonomous judgement, and mutual cooperation and support for colleagues" (Hoy & Miskel, 1996, p. 144).

Bureaucratic Orientation: An orientation in which "teachers believe that the final authority in organizational decision making rests with the administration; teachers believe that they should be loyal, obedient, and respectful of their principal and administrative decisions; and rules and regulations should be strictly followed" (DiPaola & Hoy, 1994).

Trust: "An individual's or group's willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that the latter party is benevolent, reliable, competent, honest, and open" (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999, p. 189).

Basic Assumptions

Quantitative research methods were used in this study. Correlations and multiple regression analyses are expected to provide accurate indicators and predictions of

relationships, insights, and information germane to the questions posed. Data collection procedures emphasized confidentiality and anonymity of responses, and it is assumed accordingly that the teachers surveyed provided accurate and reliable information based on these assurances.

Limitations and Delimitations

The sample of elementary schools was confined to the state of Ohio, which limits the generalizability of the findings. Furthermore, because random sample selection is implausible, the sample of elementary school buildings was non-random and predicated on administrative permission to conduct a survey. This further limits the generalizability to that population from which the samples are drawn. However, it may be possible to make generalizations from these results if the population in question possesses similar characteristics. It should be noted that the results reflect perceptions--faculty perceptions--of trust, enabling bureaucracy, teacher professionalism, and academic press.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

Trust is an important component of interpersonal relationships, politics, global business, and organizational effectiveness. It is probable that the very survival of a social group depends upon the members' willingness to exercise trust with one another (Rotter, 1967); and yet, the difficulty of describing trust and operationalizing it for measurement is well-noted. Trust has been described as a "conceptual confusion" (Lewis & Weigert, 1985), and its ready explanation termed "elusive" (Gambetta, 1988).

The construct of trust has been investigated and researched since the 1950s. Various definitions and scales have emerged during this time as social psychologists, business management theorists, and educational researchers have worked toward an understanding of what trust is and how best to acquire and sustain it.

Trust

Early Experimental Research

The aftermath of World War II brought about a new age of nuclear capabilities. The danger of annihilation and the stratagems of *mutually assured destruction* settled in as the Soviet Union acquired the atomic bomb and entered into a Cold War and an era of mutual suspicion with the United States.

In the 1950s, Morton Deutsch began to investigate the concept of trust and establish a theoretical foundation with the experimental application of a two-person, non-zero-sum game (Deutsch, 1958, 1960; Loomis, 1959). In a non-zero-sum or mixed-motive game comprised of two individuals, rational individual behavior is possible only in the event that mutual trust exists. Each will lose if each individual strives for maximum gains. The optimum strategy for a player is to execute decisions which further his gains and simultaneously increase the payoffs for the other person--that is, a cooperative strategy. Deutsch's study was a modification of the "Prisoner's Dilemma," as described by Luce and Raiffa (1957): Two men are arrested under suspicion of having committed a crime together, and placed in separate rooms. The authorities are convinced of their culpability but they are unable to obtain the necessary proof to convict the men. The prosecutor presents a simple choice to each man, which consists of their either confessing or not confessing to the specific crime the authorities believe they committed. If neither confesses, and cooperate with one another against the authorities, they are told that each will be booked on a fabricated minor charge; if both confess, or defect from cooperating with one another, each will be charged, but a less than maximum sentence will be recommended; however, if one confesses and the other doesn't, then the confessor will be treated leniently, perhaps freed, while the non-confessor will be prosecuted to the utmost extent of the law. The temptation resides in the fact that short-term gains for defecting over to the authorities are greater than gains for cooperating with each other. However, in the long run, the most rational, or cooperative, outcome would be for each prisoner to decide not to confess. This choice would indicate mutually cooperative or trusting behavior. Non-cooperative behavior is exhibited when one prisoner decides to confess

while the other chooses to remain silent. This scenario results in maximal gains for the confessor and maximal losses for the non-confessor. Similarly, when both prisoners choose to confess and betray one another, they are exhibiting suspicious behavior, which also results in significant loss. The dilemma resides in the fact that each prisoner faces a choice between two options, but cannot make a good decision without knowing what the other will do. Iterated Prisoner's Dilemma experimental studies investigated the effect of factors such as unilateral cooperation, unilateral defection, random feedback, matching strategies, and partial reinforcement strategies upon a subject's decision to engage in trusting (cooperative) or suspicious (non-cooperative) behavior (Agnew, & Illingworth, 1966; Bixenstine, Potash, & Wilson, 1963; Kormorita, 1965; Pylyshyn, Rapoport & Chammah, 1965; Solomon, 1960).

Prisoner's Dilemma studies provided the impetus for a type of two-person, non-zero-sum social game employed in early trust studies. It is also referred to as a mixed-motive game in which "gains or losses incurred by each person are a function of the choices made by one's partner as well as the choices made by oneself" (Deutsch, 1960). Mixed-motive games allow participants to exhibit cooperative behavior that results in mutually beneficial outcomes, as well as competitive and exploitative behavior, which, when reciprocated, tends toward mutual harm (Lindskold, 1978). The design of some of these experiments consisted of a simple 2 x2 matrix:

	A	B
X	(+9, +9)	(-10, +10)
Y	(+10, -10)	(-9, -9)

Subject 1 must choose between the X and Y rows, and subject two must choose between A and B columns. Each subject's choice and his partner's response determine the amount of money gained or lost by each subject. For instance, if subject one chooses row X, and subject two chooses column B, then subject one loses ten dollars while subject two gains ten dollars. A more cooperative choice, naturally, would be for subject one to choose row X and subject two to choose column A. This would land each subject in the AX box with a mutual gain of nine dollars, and begin to establish a pattern of trust instead of defection.

Researchers employed the mixed-motive game format in order to record the frequency of cooperative behavior, or mutual trust, between subjects, and to investigate various conditions which tended to promote trust and mitigate suspicion. For instance, an individual's motivational orientation and the type of communication between participants were variables selected as factors in early studies (Deutsch, 1958, 1960; Loomis, 1959).

Motivational orientation. Verbal game instructions were given to experimental subjects that consigned them to one of three different motivational orientations: cooperative, individualistic, or competitive. It was hypothesized that each of these would have a particular effect on the manifestation of trust or suspicion in the two-person, non-zero-sum game structure.

The cooperative motivational orientation was established by telling both players that they should value the other player's welfare in addition to their own. Moreover, the researcher conveyed that the other player felt the same way. The prediction was that this orientation would be most successful in establishing a relationship of mutual trust.

Conversely, the individualistically-oriented subject was told that his own interest was paramount, and that he should have no regard for the welfare of the other player, as the other player had little or no regard for him. It was thought that this motivational orientation would be unlikely to establish a behavior pattern of mutual trust, especially in the absence of the one subject's choices being made known to other.

Motivational orientations for competitiveness were initiated by advising each subject to do as well for himself as he could. The object was to win, to beat the other player and emerge as the victor. This orientation held the least likelihood for mutual trust, and in fact, was predicted to result in a higher degree of suspiciousness than either the cooperative or the individualistic orientations.

The data of the experiments supported the initial predictions (Deutsch, 1958, 1960; Loomis, 1959). A cooperative motivational orientation was most likely to be reciprocated with cooperation and trust, which resulted in mutual gain for both players. The competitive orientation was most likely to be characterized by suspicion and uncooperative behavior by each player. This resulted in mutual loss. However, those players who adopted an individualistic orientation were most likely to exhibit cooperative behavior and mutual trust only if they were made aware of a cooperative choice having been made by the other player. This was found to be true for only those who had been instructed to practice an individualistic orientation. The presence or absence of communication in the experimental setting did not seem to modify the subject disposition of either the cooperative or the competitive motivational orientation. In fact, the players of a competitive orientation often engaged in communication to deceive their opponents (Deutsch, 1958). Both orientations inclined toward trust or suspicion despite

the presence of communication. Subjects of an individualistic orientation, however, were playing for themselves, and were not particularly concerned about cooperating or playing to win. They tended to make rational, cooperative decisions that resulted in mutual gain only under conditions of communication. In the absence of knowledge of the other player's intentions, the individualistically oriented made as few trusting choices as the competitive orientation (Solomon, 1960).

Elements of Co-operation. In the presence of communication, the essential elements of cooperative, trusting behavior are an interplay of credible threats and a method of absolution. Deutsch (1958) explains how these components are established and maintained,

That is Person I expects Person II to perform certain activities which are necessary to I's gratifications and, in turn, intends to perform certain activities which are necessary to II's gratifications; a complementary situation exists for II vis-a-vis intentions and expectations. However, for the co-operative interchange to be a stable ongoing system, each person must have *a way of reacting to violation of his expectation* which is known to the other and which can serve as an inhibitor of violation, since the frequent occurrence of violations will break down the system of interchange. (p. 273)

Studies support this assertion (Lindsfold & Bennett, 1973; Solomon, 1960) and indicate that interpersonal relationships of trust are not encouraged when cooperative players either are unable to or choose not to engage in retaliation when exploited. The exploitative party is more likely to move toward a position of mutual cooperation and trust when the highly cooperative party engages in incremental, reliable, and conciliatory actions--actions which, when necessary--are buttressed with credible threats (Deutsch, 1958). Credible threats are essential to a system of trusting exchanges because they allow each party a method to which it may resort in the event of trust violations.

Deutsch further contended that once a cooperative interplay is established, there should be a method of absolution in the event that the system is derailed temporarily because of an uncooperative action. Such events are likely to occur due to chance alone. The four elements of a cooperative system of interpersonal relationships are expectation, intention, retaliation, and absolution. One or more of these four components were conveyed through the use of notes to the players in Deutsch's (1958, p. 274) two-person, non-zero-sum experiment,

Expectation: "I would like to co-operate so that I can win."

Intention: " I will co-operate and I would like you to co-operate. That way we both can win."

Retaliation: "If you don't co-operate, then I will choose so that you can't win."

Absolution: "If you decide to co-operate and make a co-operative choice after first not doing so, then I will co-operate."

The Osgood proposal. Non-zero-sum game studies provided confirmation that once distrust and suspicion emerge as a pattern in interpersonal relations, it is exceedingly difficult to bring the parties back to a cooperative exchange (Deutsch, 1958; Deutsch, 1960; Osgood, 1959; Pilisuk & Skolnick, 1968; Solomon, 1960). Lindsfold (1978) stated that non-cooperative or suspicious behavior often is met with a competitive orientation by the other party which eventually deteriorates into mutual loss and defeat. This cycle, however, can be reversed if each party will cooperate in the search of a mutually beneficial solution. Osgood (1959) found that if one party initiated small, conciliatory moves preceded by honest, prior announcements, then cooperation from an adversary was likely to occur. This approach is labeled GRIT for graduated and reciprocated

initiatives in tension reduction. Lindsfold (1978, p.776) lists ten steps to the GRIT technique, "general statement; clear announcement of each initiative; initiatives executed as announced; reciprocation invited but not demanded; initiatives continued without reciprocation; initiatives susceptible to verification; maintain retaliatory capability; precise retaliation to escalation; diversify initiatives; match any reciprocation in future initiatives." These unilateral signals of good intentions should be executed without one party sacrificing its security to the other. Neither unilateral capitulation (Shure, Mecker, & Hansford, 1965) nor unilateral trust (Solomon, 1960) is as effective in inducing mutual cooperation as is a strategy of announced, conciliatory moves with an offer to the other party to reciprocate (Pilisuk & Skolnick, 1968). If the other party chooses to behave in an exploitative or hostile manner, then each non-cooperative behavior is answered with a fittingly commensurate retaliatory action. The idea is to establish a pattern of mutual trust by unilaterally demonstrating trustworthiness--thereby gradually achieving a state of rapprochement and cooperation. The Osgood Proposal was supported by experiments which found that a conditionally cooperative approach is most likely to re-orient a player from either an individualistic or competitive framework to one of cooperation, thereby mitigating exploitative and suspicious behaviors (Lindsfold, 1978; Solomon, 1960).

TIT-for-TAT. In order to compel a competitive player to cooperate in an iterated Prisoner's Dilemma situation, Axelrod (1984) advocated a TIT-for-TAT strategy. The strategic player "reciprocates both cooperation and defection" (p. 110). After cooperating on the first move, a player simply mimics whatever the other player chooses on the previous move. "TIT for TAT is a strategy of cooperation based upon reciprocity" (Axelrod, 1997, p.16). He further recommended that a player refrain from envy, being

the first to defect, or being too clever. While both players would do best if they fully cooperated, Axelrod's seminal studies demonstrated that a TIT-for-TAT strategy assures the reciprocating player that at least he won't lose spectacularly.

It is difficult for some scholars to generalize the success of the TIT-for-TAT approach to environments outside of Prisoner's Dilemma experiments (Govier, 1992), but Axelrod and Dion (1988) contend that strategies and behaviors based on reciprocity are commonly employed by governments and also members of the animal kingdom such as birds and monkeys. Osgood's GRIT seems to contain broader possibilities to achieving cooperation, because unlike TIT-for-TAT, it contains possibilities for extended communication. In the face of intractable defection, however, an appropriate GRIT response to the competitive player is a kind of TIT-for-TAT retaliation.

Trust as a Personality Trait

One of the earliest scales for measuring trust was developed by Rotter in 1967. He defined trust as an expectancy that a verbal or written statement by another person or group can be relied upon. He conceived of trust as a psychological construct, or behavioral trait, which was gradually developed and formed by way of an individual's acculturation. From these unique experiences would emerge a generalized expectancy, or predilection, to engage in trusting or mistrusting behavior over time and in various situations (Lindsfold, 1978). Trust was posited as a personality trait which developed gradually by way of one's life experiences. This disposition to trust and to attribute trustworthiness to others was gauged by means of a psychometric measure, the *Interpersonal Trust Scale*, which gauged the amount of agreement with statements about the trustworthiness of strangers, politicians, public figures, parents, and teachers. Rotter

(1967, 1971, 1980) found that high trusters were perceived as independent, friendly, and popular. They were more apt to be affiliated with a religious institution, and of a higher socioeconomic status than low trusters. He later defined trust as believing the communication of others until given good reason not to believe them, "the high truster says to himself or herself, I will trust the person until I have clear evidence that he or she cannot be trusted. The low truster says, I will not trust the person until there is clear evidence that he or she can be trusted" (Rotter, 1980, p. 6).

Wrightsman (1966) used a two-person, non-zero-sum game to correlate trusting behaviors with personality traits and attitudes. This instrument was named the *Philosophies of Human Nature Scale*, and measured personality traits such as positiveness, trustworthiness, strength of will, altruism, and independence. Trusting subjects measured significantly more likely to be trustworthy and hold a positive view of human nature. In the first of two experiments, he found that trusting subjects demonstrated a greater likelihood to possess altruistic and independent attitudes and personality traits.

In the 1980s, the focus shifted from framing trust as simply a dispositional, or generalized personality trait, to an investigation of the dynamics of interpersonal relationships, especially those in organizations (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Johnson-George & Swap, 1982; Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995; Rempel, Holmes, & Zanna, 1985). This change in emphasis was predicated upon economic and political factors such as global competition, shareholder profits, and corporate redesigns--all of which necessitated increased productivity and improved efficiencies. It was postulated that trust would improve interdependence and teamwork as businesses adopted a more

participative approach to decision making (Lawler, 1992). This shift in focus was accompanied by an investigation of those factors associated with trust in an interpersonal, organizational environment. Hosmer (1995) recasts the definition of trust in organizational language,

Trust is the reliance by one person, group, or firm upon a voluntarily accepted duty on the part of another person, group, or firm to recognize and protect the rights and interests of all others engaged in a joint endeavor or economic exchange. (p. 393)

Trust Research in Corporate Organizations

"There is no single variable which so thoroughly influences interpersonal and group behavior as does trust" (Golembiewski & McConkie, 1975, p. 131). In business, a reputation for non-opportunistic behavior has the effect of reducing transaction costs and strengthening economic activity. Trust is rational economically and often is bounded informally with voluntary good-faith expectations or formally with legal contracts (Hosmer, 1995). Studying trust in hierarchical relationships can be complicated by individual and group expectations of workplace allegiances and reciprocity (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000).

The spiral-reinforcement model of trust. Zand (1972) argued that trust "is not a global feeling of warmth or affection" (p. 230) but a conscious appraisal of one's vulnerability to another that varies with the circumstance. Trust is composed of "high vulnerability, low control, modest benefit, high possible loss, and belief that the other person will not abuse your vulnerability" (Zand, 1997, p. 91). He studied and contrasted low-trust and high-trust problem-solving groups in an experimental setting composed of Fortune 500 executives. High-trust groups better clarified goals; exchanged more accurate information; exhibited less social uncertainty; explored a wider scope of

possibilities in the search for solutions; and exhibited greater commitment to implementation of a strategy than did low-trust groups. Low-trust groups were hindered in their pursuit of effective problem-solving because information was distorted and concealed; valuable energy was squandered in a quest for group control; and other member's ideas were not readily tolerated or acted upon. Because the group was low-trust, its members--in keeping with Zand's definition of trust--sought to reduce their vulnerability to one another in the areas of information, influence, and control. This resulted in misunderstanding, misinterpretation, and an atmosphere of surveillance rather than coordination. Low-trust group members resist cohesion; they are reluctant to allow other members to exercise influence or control over them. This behavior interferes in the disclosure of information or the search for solutions to organizational problems. Moreover, distrust, like trust, reinforces itself through reciprocity. If one perceives another to be lacking in trust, the natural response is to exhibit little trust and thereby reduce one's vulnerability. Zand used this observation to conceptualize the spiral-reinforcement model of trust. It is important that group members find ways to initiate, reinforce, and reciprocate at the outset expectations and intentions of trust.

Zand showed that distrust weakened the dynamics necessary to achieving effective and efficient problem-solving. This tendency is partly explained by his observation that groups assembled for purposes of solving a problem are concerned with not only the problem but also how the members relate to one another interpersonally. He posited that trust is a behavior that "conveys appropriate information, permits mutuality of influence, encourages self-control, and avoids the abuse of the vulnerability of others" (1997, p. 238).

Stages of executive trust. Gabarro (1978) conducted a series of clinical interviews with newly-appointed corporate presidents and their respective vice-presidents. They reported nine conditions of trust: integrity; motives; consistency of behavior; openness; discreetness; functional/specific competence; business sense; and judgment. Gabarro reported that superiors most value the trust dimensions of integrity, competence, and consistency in their subordinates, and that subordinates are inclined to value in their superiors not only integrity, but also motives and openness (p. 298). Gabarro described four gradual stages of trust development or evolution between corporate presidents and vice-presidents. The first stage consisted of initial impressions, familiarity, and the setting of expectations; the second stage involved further knowledge gathering, exploration, and identifying the bases of trust; bases of influence were formulated in stage three; and stage four was the accretion of an interpersonal contract based on interpersonal influence, trust, and expectations. This mutual understanding was the result of careful exploration, information-gathering, and negotiation; and was conducive to an effective and stable organizational relationship.

Conditions of interpersonal corporate trust. Butler & Cantrell (1984) described the multidimensionality of interpersonal trust by the use of five determinants: integrity, competency, consistency, loyalty, and openness,

The dimensions include (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 to a person; (e) openness or mental accessibility, willingness to share ideas and information freely. (p.19)

They attempted to capture the rank order importance of the components of trust in an organizational setting by investigating the perceptions that both executive and

subordinate role-players held for one another. They found support for the prediction that the integrity, competence, and consistency of subordinates are of greater importance to the executive than the subordinate's loyalty and openness. This confirmed Gabarro's (1978) findings. For superiors and subordinates both, the rank order in importance of the bases for trust were competence, integrity, consistency, loyalty, and openness. The primary value of this study was the identification and investigation of the multidimensionality of trust, and a clarification of the notion that individuals who occupy different levels in a hierarchy hold different expectations toward each other about what constitutes trust. In short, interpersonal organizational trust relationships seem to be conditionally based. Later research by Kramer (1996) found that subordinates recalled with greater frequency trust-related episodes than did their superiors, and that there existed between each party variation in trust assessments and the import attached to violations of trust. This finding underscores the notion that factors of trust can vary independently.

The Conditions of Trust Inventory. Butler (1991) conducted 84 interviews with managers and incorporated the findings of Gabarro (1978) and Jennings (1971) in an attempt to formulate ten content valid conditions of trust. The research team identified the conditions of trust as "availability, competence, consistency, discreteness, fairness, integrity, loyalty, openness, promise fulfillment, and receptivity" (p. 648). He derived from this data an instrument labeled the Conditions of Trust Inventory, a set of ten scales which he subsequently administered to managers, subordinates, machine operators, and management students in an attempt to establish its reliability and validity. Butler asserted that this measure of trust was of more use to managers because it identified the conditions

of trust--it could be employed as a diagnostic tool to uncover the origination of low trust conditions--as opposed to simply defining and understanding trust as a construct.

Through the judicious use of the scales, a manager was empowered to address those policies, practices, and areas--in short, those conditions--which the scales indicated exercised an adverse impact on interpersonal relations and organizational efficiency.

Affect and cognition-based trust in organizations. According to the sociological perspective, trust is a social reality composed of attitudinal and cognitive elements (Barber, 1983; Lewis & Weigert, 1985). It is a property of collective units, and has no expression in solitary individuals. Trust lessens complexity in social systems (Luhmann, 1979) and enables individuals and groups to cope with vulnerability and lack of certainty. Trust emerges from the dynamics of organizational and cultural variables; its meaning involves expectations of technical competence and fiduciary responsibility or obligation--which connotes the duty that an individual exercises in his social relationships to place the interests of others above his own (Barber, 1983). Both of these dimensions are expressions of the overarching definition of trust, which, according to the sociological perspective, is the "expectation of the persistence of the moral social order" (Barber, 1983, p. 14). Trust requires perpetual effort and reciprocity in social relationships. It is crucial in a social system because it undergirds the expectations necessary for the functioning of a society's monetary currency, political process, laws, and institutions (Lewis & Weigert, 1985).

Trust is cognitive insofar as it is the result of choice, familiarity, discrimination, or "good reasons" (Lewis & Weigert, 1985; McAllister, 1995). Because it involves an element of risk and vulnerability, it is a "leap" beyond reason and partly based on the

social awareness that such exercises are commonly performed by others (Luhmann, 1979). Trust is affective because it consists of emotional social attachments, some of which can be deep and strong. This explains why violations, betrayals, and abuses of trust--both public and private--frequently incur such passionate wrath and indignation (Lewis & Weigert, 1985). Individuals respond emotionally to trust relationships, "because they are, by definition, in a position of vulnerability" (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000, p. 11). The third sociological base of trust is the behavioral element. This connotes interacting socially as if trust existed, the signaled expectation of which in turn invites reciprocity of trust.

McAllister (1995) borrowed from the sociological perspective, developed a 25-item measure of interpersonal trust, and studied the cognitive and affective dimensions of trust in association with organizational cooperation. His sample consisted of 194 managers from various industries. He found that although trust is a two-factor construct, managerial cognitive trust in organizations is linked inextricably to affective trust, which is predicated on the frequency of social interactions and expressions of altruism, or "peer-affiliative citizenship" behavior. McAllister noted that these affective components of trust, or "confident attributions" (p. 30) could influence the mechanisms of interpersonal relationships to the extent that the stability derived from this factor of trust could very well mitigate or supplant the need for cognitive trust. Moreover, the existence of managerial trust was found to be associated with varying levels of control-based monitoring and assessments of worker performance; both of which impacted organizational efficiency.

The Organizational Trust Inventory. The Organizational Trust Inventory

(Cummings & Bromiley, 1995) was developed as an institutional tool to reduce economic transactions costs such as controlling, monitoring, and negotiating. It was designed to measure trust between and within organizations, departments, and units; and unlike conventional economic transaction cost theory, is predicated on the optimistic assumption that individuals in organizations make good-faith efforts to honor their commitments, display honesty, and are neither exploitative nor opportunistic in their business dealings and negotiations. Cummings and Bromiley (1995) sketched a definitional matrix by decomposing trust into three dimensions: (1) keeps commitments; (2) negotiates honestly; and (3) avoids taking excessive advantage. This formed a three-by-three matrix as each dimension was sorted across an affective, cognitive, and intention component and was represented on the OTI instrument with the following sentence prefaces, "We feel..." (affective); "We think..." (cognitive); and "We intend..." (behavioral intention).

Survey items were subject to factor analysis to arrive at the three dimensions of trust, and the researchers demonstrated the reliability and validity of the measures. This instrument is an example of a trust measure designed to tap three significant dimensions of trust (reliability, integrity, and fairness) in corporate organizations over three components of belief: affective, cognitive, and conative. Both a long inventory form and shortened version were developed. Each consists of a seven-point Likert scale.

Role-based trust. A presumption of trustworthiness is extended to individuals by virtue of their position in an organization. Trust of this nature is in contradistinction to lengthier processes of trust based on the acquisition and gradual evolution of personalized information about a person's integrity, competence, and consistency. Role-based trust is

to some degree an impersonal function of the social system (Barber, 1983). It is similar to category-based trust, which accrues on the basis of membership, affiliation, or classification. Role-based trust, when of a positive nature, lessens reciprocity costs, reduces uncertainty, and accommodates personnel transitions in a smooth and efficient fashion. To the trustee, role-based trust can be either beneficial or disadvantageous, depending on his placement in the organization. For example, Rosen and Jerdee (1997) conducted a study of the influence of subordinate organizational placement and position upon trust and reported that lower-status employees and minority employees were rated by others as presumed to be less likely to place organizational goals before their own or exercise good judgment and competence when making decisions.

The Construct of Trust

Because it is a complex construct with many components of unequal contribution (Rempel, Holmes, & Zanna, 1985), the measurement of trust has advanced more quickly than its conceptual clarification (Wrightsmann, 1991). A review of the trust literature however, yields general agreement among authors and researchers that the primary characteristics of trust are: vulnerability, reliability, confidence, honesty, benevolence, competence, and openness.

Risk-taking and vulnerability. A person is willing to assume a risk, say, of placing a wager, if he calculates that his potential gains are significantly greater than his potential losses, despite that there may be a low probability of his, in fact, winning the wager. Deutsch (1958), in his definition of trusting behavior, does little to distinguish it from risk-taking or gambling behavior. He asserts that both behaviors are actually different sides of the same coin, and that a person chooses to engage in trusting behavior, or risk

vulnerability, when he anticipates that the ratio of positive to negative motivational consequences is sufficiently large enough to allow himself to become vulnerable and engage in trusting behavior. If he perceives that the ratio is insufficiently large, then he will engage in suspicious behavior. He explained that an event is of "negative motivational consequence when it decreases or prevents an increase in the welfare of the individual" (p.266). Trust involves vulnerability and a calculation of benefits and risks, similar to gambling. Put another way, if participation in an event does not require vulnerability to the possibility of sabotage, defection, or betrayal, then there is no need to trust (Gambetta, 1988). "Without vulnerability, trust is unnecessary because outcomes are inconsequential for the trustor" (Moorman, Zaltman, & Deshpande, 1992). Consequently, the common denominator for all trust situations is the willingness of the trustor to take a risk to be vulnerable (Johnson-George & Swap, 1982).

Zand (1972) modified his conception of trust from a dispositional to interpersonal orientation when he defined it as the "dependent interactions of a dyad" (Hosmer, 1995). He posited trust as the unilateral choice of one person to make himself vulnerable to the actions of a second person over whose behavior he had no control. His conception contained elements of dependence, confidence, and an expectation of reciprocity.

Predictability and dependability. "Inconsistencies between words and action decrease trust" (McGregor, 1967, p.164). Predictability is a component of trust which is based on an accrual of past evidence and experiences. It signifies an ability to anticipate an individual's actions and behaviors in various situations (Gabarro, 1987). It doesn't quite capture the meaning of dependability, which signifies a certain degree of vulnerability on the part of the one who is doing the depending, and a setting aside of

self-interest in order to honor a commitment on the part of the one who is being depended upon (Rempel, Holmes, & Zanna, 1985). The idea of predictability connotes forecasting-- based on an historical record--the actions of a person or group. Dependability signifies the inclination to forecast one's character. For example, a person might be predictably kleptomaniac, and hence, inarguably untrustworthy. A person can be predictably good or evil. Dependability, however, incorporates an element of benevolence combined with promptitude. Both components, when linked, form an important dimension of trust by contributing a sense of reliability, honor, responsibility, and consistency to a description of the trust construct.

Confidence. Trust is bound with expectation. Expectation that the world and its institutions are relatively stable, and that change, when it does occur, will be gradual and non-threatening. Additionally, most people exercise a quiet trust, or a confidence, or hold an expectation, that if an individual assumes a societal role, or a position in an organization, he does so because of his competence and skill. Yet, is confidence the same as trust? Although closely related concepts, Luhmann (1988) discusses perception and attribution to distinguish confidence from trust. He writes that if a man departs from his residence each morning without a weapon to protect himself, that is, if he does not stop to reflect upon alternatives and 'what-ifs,' then he is exercising confidence. To carry the example further though, if he exercises a preference among choices, and one of those considered is the possibility of his being robbed or mugged, and yet he chooses not to forearm himself, then he is engaging in trusting behavior. He may be disappointed in either instance, but if he is exercising confidence, he will attribute his disappointment to

external factors, while if he trusts, and is disappointed, he will experience some sentiment of internal attribution, or regret. Trust and confidence are interrelated in complex ways. It is difficult to have one without the other.

Honesty. Honesty connotes integrity, character, and authenticity. It is impossible to consider the various components of trust without including the concept of honesty and straightforwardness. Honesty is an indispensable component of organizational negotiations (Butler & Cantrell, 1984; Cummings & Bromiley, 1996), and both superiors and subordinates dismiss the other dimensions of trust as meaningless without an essential confidence in one another's basic truthfulness (Gabarro, 1978). An honest person displays a predictable congruence of words and actions, of keeping promises and fulfilling commitments. Integrity is particularly crucial in newly developing relationships because the participants labor under the disadvantage of having scant information on which to base their perceptions and attributions of benevolence (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995). The dimension of honesty, however, can sometimes be obtained satisfactorily through careful observation and adequately derived from third-party communications.

Benevolence. Benevolence means that a person has unselfish, even protective intentions toward another person (Mishra, 1996). Benevolence is more than simply not being opportunistic. Mishra (1996) referred to this dimension of trust as concern. It means having an interest in another person's welfare. The role of a mentor suggests this idea. A mentor or guide displays concern, good faith, and altruistic intentions toward a protege. There is a transaction of positive sentiments and behaviors from the trustee (mentor) toward the trustor (protege) (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995). Loyalty,

operationalized as "will protect you and make you look good" (Butler & Cantrell, 1984, p.22), is similar to benevolence, and was proposed as an integral component of trust between those who assumed roles as executives and subordinates. Additionally, Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) write that benevolence is one party's confidence that its interests or well-being will be extended protection by the other party.

Competence. Competence is an essential facet of trust and trustworthiness. (Butler & Cantrell, 1984; Solomon & Flores, 2001). Contemporary professional and organizational environments are simply too complex and goal-driven to abide the unskilled and incompetent. A primary concern of managers is the untrustworthy subordinate who is unable to produce a quality product or satisfactory service. (Kipnis, 1995). There is nothing of value to be derived from an exchange if the goods or services received originates from someone of deficient ability. Disappointment and difficulties will likely ensue.

If an individual misrepresents his skills and abilities, and is discovered to be a fraud, then his assertion of competence is counted as a violation of trust. However, if trust is extended to an apprentice, without sufficient consideration given to his deficient credentials, then the fault lies with the trustor, since no explicit misrepresentation of the apprentice's abilities occurred (Solomon & Flores, 2001, p.85).

Expressing confidence in a person's competence frequently motivates and encourages him to redoubled efforts and often translates into a desire to maintain the respect and high opinion of the person or persons who noted his abilities and expertise.

Openness. The exchange of thoughts and information in a genuine, authentic manner characterizes openness. In both organizations and personal relationships, people

value frank exchanges and communication with others. The linchpin of the Theory Z organization is openness and honesty (Ouchi, 1981). Members of an organization appreciate receiving candid and constructive performance evaluations from their supervisors (Butler & Cantrell, 1984; Gabarro, 1978). This dimension of trust, however, is sensitive to the deleterious effects of exploitation and manipulation, and the initiator is likely to cease sharing communications altogether if his revelations are abused, or suspected of being abused. Openness must be tempered with discretion (Gabarro, 1978); with the perception that sensitive information will not be divulged cavalierly.

Fractured Trust

Distrust and betrayal. Distrust has been characterized as a psychological disorder (Erikson, 1963), as indicative of non-cooperation in mixed motive games (Axelrod, 1984), an ephemeral psychological state (Lewis & Weigert, 1985), and as one organizational member's response to another's decision to engage in an act of personal betrayal (Elangovan & Shapiro, 1998). Expectations that are unmet or not reciprocated strip away trust and modify attitudes (Jones & George, 1998).

The presence of trust in organizations and among groups acts as a cohesive agent (Zand, 1997). It allows people to pursue their responsibilities free of doubt and uncertainty. A group whose members trust one another is able to achieve common goals and objectives with the unstinting and vigorous contributions of each member's expertise and support. It is able to overcome great challenges and extreme adversity. An example of this ability is the New York firefighters who arrived on the horrible scene following the World Trade Center's collapse. This team of rescuers trusted each other's expertise, abilities, and good judgement. That sense of cohesion allowed each individual to carry

out his responsibilities with confidence and efficiency. A team of members who trust one another exhibit a resolution and determination which manifests itself in increased productivity, efficiency, strength, and inspiration (Ouchi, 1981).

Zand (1997) worked as a consultant with various leaders in several companies and observed that just as trust stimulates productivity, cohesion, efficiency, and group goal attainment, distrust depresses the same effects. The results are so predictable that he labeled them the laws of trust. He noted that distrust drives out trust, distrusting groups self-destruct, and that distrust inhibits confidence and creativity. To paraphrase Gresham's law of money: bad money drives out good money; similarly mistrust drives out trust (Zand, 1997). Employees are not as productive and efficient after having their perceptions of trust abused. This is because they tend to withdraw from the violator (Robinson, 1996), which is a typical revenge behavior (Bies & Tripp, 1996).

Paranoia is a manifestation of extreme distrust. Delusional thinking is often attributed to paranoiacs, but a person who deeply mistrusts everyone is not necessarily delusional (Solomon & Flores, 2001). In an organization, extreme distrust is dysfunctional because it militates against group cohesion and goal identification (Zand, 1997; Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). Furthermore, extreme distrust is demoralizing and cowardly. As Ghandi said, "Brave people disdain distrust" (Govier, 1992). Yamagishi (2001) regarded generalized distrust as a "learned defense strategy for gullible people who cannot protect themselves properly in risky social situations" (p. 125). They indiscriminately label everyone as unworthy of trust, which provides the basis for their subsequent social isolation. This begins a reinforcing cycle of distrust, because social isolates avoid social interaction opportunities through which it might be possible to

develop close, psychological connections; that is, they don't allow for themselves that variety of experiences necessary for acquiring a type of "social intelligence," which is conducive to the formation of generalized trust. Finally, it should be noted that cynicism is a manifestation of extreme distrust, and is a close cousin to paranoia (Solomon & Flores, 2001).

The loss of trust can be immediate or gradual. Scant consideration is given to trust until such a time as it is absent. "For trust to be relevant, there must be the possibility of exit, betrayal, defection" (Gambetta, 1988). When we trust someone, we imply that we expect his behavior to be beneficial to our interests. Suspicion gives rise to anxious anticipation and fears of violation, damage, disappointment, and hurt. The perception of betrayal, even if erroneous, is just as damaging to a relationship as an actual breach of trust. It is equally likely to produce negative sentiments, actions, withdrawal, and countermeasures. Parties who feel violated entertain no expectations of benevolence or integrity from their perpetrators.

Distrust is difficult to overcome because an individual who harbors suspicions is prone to sift out information that confirms his cognitive perceptions (Robinson, 1996). "Distrust impedes the communication which could overcome it...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). Moreover, withdrawal and social isolation compound the problem of selective perception. This causes a vicious cycle of distrust breeding further distrust (Yamagishi, 2001).

Organizational behaviors that lead to situations of distrust or perceived betrayal include non-adherence to formal rules, breach of contracts, lying, misattribution of ideas,

disclosures of confidences, public criticism, avoiding job responsibilities, and broken promises (Bies & Tripp, 1996). For those who have been betrayed, several responses are possible, including resignation, forgiveness, withdrawal, vengeful feuding, or even violence.

Most organizations are conducive structurally to the development of trust because they do not, for instance, regularly engage in employee surveillance. This is true primarily because they realize that their structures simply are not able to accurately evaluate or monitor all or most employee behavior (Elangovan & Shapiro, 1998). Besides, most people find the idea of worker surveillance objectionable and demoralizing, and its existence conveys a closed, crabbed environment. Additionally, it requires a large expenditure of energy to formalize specific rules, policies, and behavior codes. Monitoring, assessing violations, and enforcing compliance might prove counterproductive and create resentment, malingering, and demoralization (Govier, 1992). Robinson (1996) reported that when employees perceived being betrayed by employers, trust deteriorated with the result that productivity and morale declined. The emergence, therefore, of a trusting environment which operates on expectations of employee integrity, benevolence, openness, and competence requires less energy and hence, greater efficiencies.

Betrayal is defined as "a voluntary violation of mutually known pivotal expectations of the trustor by the trusted party (trustee), which has the potential to threaten the well being of the trustor" (Elangovan & Shapiro, 1998, p. 548).

The *Process Model of Opportunistic Betrayal* (Elangovan & Shapiro, 1998) delineates several motivations for betrayal such as need, crises, political gain, and

opportunism. These motivations are weighed against any current benefits being derived from the relationship. Motivations are further tempered by a calculation of the penalty cost. This cost incorporates the probability of detection (penalty probability) and assignment of responsibility (penalty severity). Those who engage in betrayal and trustbreaking often do so from motives of self-interest and only after considerable reflection, calculation, and deciding that the gains outweigh the costs. The incentive to betray increases with the certainty that the trustbreaker will not suffer significant retribution or repercussions. As the trustee considers betrayal, his expressions and sentiments of benevolence and integrity toward the trustor diminish considerably.

Betrayal casts a pall of instability, negative affect, and uncertainty over a relationship (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). The person or group betrayed assesses the violation cognitively and emotionally and then decides whether to withdraw from the relationship or act in an attempt to restore it. Restoration requires each party's equal commitment and effort to renegotiate its terms.

Lewicki and Bunker (1996) write of trust slowly developing through three distinct stages of a relationship, and consequently, violations of trust correspond with either calculus-based, knowledge-based, or identification-based trust relationships.

Calculus-based trust is common in commercial exchanges. Initial trust of this type is based on lack of evidence to the contrary (Gambetta, 1988). Calculative trust is predicated on some form of *quid pro quo* as a party consciously figures the benefits of exercising trusting behaviors and good faith dealings as opposed to the social penalties or legal sanctions for severing it. It is similar to "deterrence-based trust" (Shapiro, Sheppard, & Cheraskin, 1992). For example, the prospect of sullyng one's reputation for a

short-term gain might be reckoned as too high a cost with too small a benefit. If a calculus-based trust violation occurs, it usually involves a relatively recent relationship in which a low amount of emotional investment, credible information about the party's motivations, sentimental attachment, and vulnerability exist. If a lack of trust emerges, the relationship can be terminated quickly without compunction. Otherwise, in cases of a trust breach, the other party may elect to either renegotiate or simply cease the relationship. Each party will experience minimum expenditures of cognitive and emotional energy because the relationship had not developed beyond a simple "business," or transactional nature (Lewicki & Stevenson, 1997).

Relational or knowledge-based trust is contingent on a high degree of familiarity and information. Affective or emotional investments are made by each party. Courtship is an example of relational or knowledge-based trust; it involves regular communication as each party acquires an understanding of the proclivities, likes, dislikes, moods, and character of the other (Shapiro, Sheppard, & Cheraskin, 1992). This knowledge helps a person form an idea about the predictability, or generalized expectancy, of the other person. A trust violation occurs if one party perceives that the other willfully chose to behave in an untrustworthy manner. These breaches are accompanied by a moderate amount of cognitive and emotional activity, and may never fully be repaired if the behavior violation occurs.

Identification-based trust is predicated upon identification with the other person's desires and intentions (Lewicki & Stevenson, 1997), and takes a considerable amount of time and emotional investment to establish. It is a deeper extension of relational trust. Trust violations usually result in significant cognitive and emotional disequilibrium.

Breakdowns frequently are accompanied by great amounts of emotional energy, and the psychological devastation can have a shattering effect on a person's interests and sense of self. A sense of moral outrage often is experienced by the person whose trust is betrayed. In these scenarios, revenge becomes a likely countermeasure.

Revenge. Bies & Tripp (1996) contemplated several revenge responses to violations of trust: revenge fantasies, doing nothing, private confrontation, identity restoration, social withdrawal, feuding, and forgiveness. To respond to a trust violation by "doing nothing" might seem an odd way to achieve vindication, until one recollects the adage, "Success is the best revenge." Doing nothing might be an initial response of one who chooses to redirect his vindictive sentiments into something positive, constructive and self-improving (Matthews, 1988). Vengeful behavior often results in the betrayed withdrawing from the betrayer, and giving that person the "silent treatment." In an organization, this would take the form of withholding assistance, resources, and psychological support. If revenge escalates to the feuding dimension in an organization, then sabotage, political intrigue, and even career termination are possibilities.

Any one of several types of trust violations might spur a desire for revenge. Certain breaches of trust are harmful to the "civic order" (Bies & Tripp, 1996, p. 248). For instance, perceptions of rule violations, changing the rules after the fact, and contract breaches might translate into retaliatory behaviors, as might honor violations such as lying, malingering, and divulging information given in confidence (Bies & Tripp, 1996). Additionally, social identity trust violations such as impugning one's reputation, public criticism, insults, or false accusations frequently are answered with vengeful countermeasures. To some extent, the formalized process of filing and resolving

grievances as a correction for contract irregularities provides employees in organizations and schools an alternative to maladaptive revenge behaviors arising from trust breaches.

Reconciliation. The person whose trust has been violated, and yet decides to forgive the violator, empowers himself. He, not the perpetrator, assumes the initiative, and bravely chooses to restore trust and eschew destructive sentiments and behaviors (Bies & Tripp, 1996). Forgiveness is more than an attitude or a disposition; it is a series of actions, and is less likely to be misinterpreted if the betrayed articulates to the betrayer an initial verbal overture such as "I forgive you," or "Forget it" (Solomon & Flores, 2001).

Repairing broken trust requires a bilateral commitment. Each party must be prepared to invest the time and energy and be motivated by the belief that the relationship is valuable and worth salvaging (Lewicki & Bunker, 1996). It is crucial that the person who violated the trust accept responsibility for his actions. Lewicki & Bunker (1996, p. 131) outline a four step process:

1. Recognize and acknowledge that a violation has occurred.
2. Determine the nature of the violation--that is, what "caused" it--and admit that one has caused the event.
3. Admit that the act was "destructive."
4. Accept responsibility for the effects of one's actions.

The victim next has four choices from which to select. He can reject any intentions to rescue the relationship, or he can forgive the violator and demand reasonable acts of reparation. He can acknowledge forgiveness and yet demand unreasonable conditions before he would be amenable to restoring trust, or he can simply convey forgiveness with no conditions attached. The ultimate choice often is the result of some kind of negotiation or communication between the betrayed and the betrayer (Jones & George, 1998).

Trust in Schools

Trust is the "mortar that binds leader to follower" (Nanus, 1989, p.101), and is essential for establishing interpersonal relationships (Hughes, 1974), and effective schools (Hoy, Tarter, & Witkoskie, 1992; Tarter, Bliss, & Hoy, 1989). A public school principal's job description covers a wide array of tasks, responsibilities, and leadership roles. To be successful at any level of the principalship--elementary, middle, or high school, requires a clear understanding and deft management of several issues: school reform initiatives, special education law, school safety, health and crisis management, mandatory proficiency tests, community/board relations, teacher shortages, teacher retirements, teacher evaluations, bargaining units and negotiated agreements, student discipline procedures, and budget shortfalls. Moreover, a public school principal typically works long hours and many late evenings attending meetings, school functions, and extracurricular sporting events. In this milieu, an effective leader must be capable of providing to the various stakeholders the vision, rationale, and motivation sufficient to implementing gradual, systemic change in a school (Putnam & Borko, 1997).

Credibility is the currency of the principalship. Through the use of factor analysis, Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) identified trust in schools as one factor that is best described as having five facets or "faces." Principals who demonstrate the dimensions of the concept of trust--benevolence, openness, integrity, reliability, competence, and confidence--strengthen their credibility, and allow themselves the social capital sufficient to initiate and sustain change, new programs, and school reform plans. Indeed, trust is the foundation block of school effectiveness (Cunningham & Gresso, 1993) and increases the likelihood of accurate communications between superiors and subordinates

(Golembiewski & McConkie, 1975). Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) found that teacher trust in the principal and teacher trust in colleagues were associated with one another, and that faculty trust in clients was a significant predictor of parent teacher collaboration. Without trust, valuable energy oftentimes is expended on political infighting, suspiciousness, and retaliation. It is difficult to initiate change in an environment of passive resistance, sabotage, and betrayal.

The issue of trust in schools is important because schools are associated with children, taxpayer monies, and the transmittal of democratic ideals and norms (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998). People accord great value to these elements, and they assume that the public trust will not be compromised by teachers or administrators. Instruments have been developed to measure the level of trust or mistrust that exists between teachers, teachers/principals, and teachers/students (Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2001). Moreover, several studies have been conducted which examine the trust dynamics between these referents (Hoy & Kupersmith, 1985; Hoy, Sabo, & Barnes, 1996; Hoy, Tarter, & Witkoskie, 1992; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Smith, Hoy, & Sweetland, 2001; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1998). Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (1997) define two of the referents of faculty trust as,

Trust in the principal: The faculty has confidence that the principal will keep his or her word and act in the best interest of the teachers.

Trust in colleagues: The faculty believe that teachers can depend on each other in difficult situations and that teachers can rely on the integrity of their colleagues. (p. 342)

When culled from the literature, faculty trust in clients yields a definition which connotes reliable students, parental support, parental commitment, and honest interactions between teachers, students, and parents.

Hoy and Kupersmith (1985) developed three faculty trust scales which measured faculty trust in colleagues, faculty trust in the principal, and faculty trust in the school organization. Their research showed that all three aspects of trust were associated with each other and positively correlated with authenticity of the principal. They concluded that the three scales tapped different aspects of faculty trust. Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) reported similar results in that all three referents of faculty trust were moderately related to one another.

Hoffman et al. (1994) collected data from 2,777 middle school teachers and found a significant association between faculty trust in the colleagues and faculty trust in principal. Moreover, the more the principal demonstrated open behavior, as measured on a climate scale, the greater the levels of faculty trust in the principal. Both aspects of faculty trust--in colleagues and in principals--are related to overall school health (Hoy, Sabo, & Barnes, 1996).

Smith, Hoy, and Sweetland (2001) found that faculty trust in colleagues and faculty trust in the principal were related to dimensions of a healthy and open high school climate. Additionally, academic press was related positively to faculty trust in clients.

Research shows that elementary faculty trust in colleagues (Hoy, Tarter, & Witkoskie, 1992), elementary faculty trust in clients (Goddard, Tschannen-Moran, & Hoy, 2001), and faculty trust in principal (Tarter, Sabo, & Hoy, 1995) are linked to school effectiveness.

Since trust is a vital component of effective cooperation, communication, and productive relationships (Baier, 1985), and is associated with academic achievement and

a healthy school climate, it behooves the administration, within its sphere of influence, to implement and sustain those dimensions of schools which current research indicates have the greatest bearing on faculty trust.

Conclusion

The installation and maintenance of trust is integral to school efficiency, effectiveness, and improvement. Distrust is dysfunctional in an organization. It can result in phenomena such as lack of morale, withheld communications, betrayal, suspicion, retaliation, and sabotage. Such destructive manifestations are a waste of energy and resources. Moreover, the difficulties and challenges which schools encounter today in the 21st century necessitate collaborative, cohesive groups working together to solve problems, attain goals, and raise student achievement.

The construct of trust is multidimensional, but schools which can create a climate and a routine of professional interactions that reflect the attributes of honesty, competence, benevolence, reliability, and openness are better equipped to sustain a faculty and student body dedicated to excellence and learning. The faculty's beliefs concerning who is trustworthy are crucial to implementing productive cooperation. Their perspective can be examined among three referents: trust in principal, trust in colleagues, and trust in student/parents.

Bureaucracy

Educational leaders and corporate managers experience similar phenomena and challenges in their organizational structures because certain patterns are common to schools as well as other societal institutions such as business, government, and industry. As Max Weber (1947) wrote, structural transformations designed to incorporate

administrators and administrative tasks will give rise, predictably, to an assemblage of components known as a bureaucracy. Bureaucracies are prevalent because as an organization grows larger and more complex, patterns of structure naturally develop which allow people to effectively and efficiently organize their work and relationships with one another. Bureaucracies exhibit common elements and patterns of structure. Studies of related social science fields and industrial and business organizations are useful to educational leaders as they organize and think about their school and district environments.

Max Weber

Bureaucracies, according to the classical Weberian definition, are comprised of a division of labor, hierarchy of authority, rules and regulations, efficiency, impersonal orientation, promotion based on seniority and/or achievement, and specialization. As a social structure grows larger and more complex, a bureaucratic structure inevitably develops. Bureaucracies, Weber asserted, are rationally-based, promote efficiency, and are instrumental in attaining organizational goals and objectives.

Weber (1947, p. 328) distinguished three kinds of legitimate, or valid, authority structures and attached to each grounds for a particular administrative framework,

Rational grounds: resting on a belief in the 'legality' of patterns and of normative rules and the right of those elevated to authority under such rules to issue commands (legal authority).

Traditional grounds: resting on an established belief in the sanctity of immemorial traditions and the legitimacy of the status of those exercising authority under them (traditional authority).

Charismatic grounds: resting on devotion to the specific and exceptional sanctity, heroism or exemplary character of an individual person, and of the normative patterns or order revealed or ordained by him (charismatic authority).

Rational grounds for authority give rise to formal and impersonal structures, of which a bureaucracy is the most highly developed (Dibble, 1965). The other two grounds for authority, traditional and charismatic, are manifest in social structures that are personal, loose, and fluid.

Weber described in precise terms the bureaucratic structure that emerges from rational authority organizations. Udy (1959) defines these formal organizations as "any social group engaged in pursuing explicit announced objectives through manifestly coordinated effort" (pp. 792-793). For example, individuals in authority occupy an office, which they regard as a career (Scott, 1998), and from which they derive the power to issue commands. The official, however, is subject to precise regulations, control, and discipline. The person who obeys the official does so only insofar as he is a member of the organization; furthermore, he owes obedience not to the individual, who can be replaced altogether, but to the impersonal order, that is, the office. The orientation of a bureaucratic structure is impersonal; decisions and relationships are based on fact, not feelings. Weber (1947, p. 331) describes a bureaucratic atmosphere as "the dominance of a spirit of formalistic impersonality, *"sine ira et studio,"* without hatred or passion, and hence without affection or enthusiasm." A certain amount of shielding from rogue political machinations is made possible in an impersonal environment, because individuals can take refuge in a formalistic mien while being careful to adhere closely to policies, rules, and regulations. Such strategies make it difficult to accuse them of wrongdoing or poor attitudes. Moreover, the rational-legal structure allows subordinates to exercise greater independence and judgement because allegiance is owed to the

organization, not the individual (Scott, 1998; Smith & Ross, 1978). Superiors are bound by the same rules and principles as subordinates, so it is easy to divine correct and appropriate decisions and behaviors.

Official functions in a bureaucracy are circumscribed by rules and enforced by those who are trained specifically to execute administrative tasks. There are clearly marked areas of technical spheres of competence, functions, and obligations--that is, a division of labor. This division of labor produces specialization which increases efficiency (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Officeholders do not own the means of production, but are accountable for their use, maintenance, and efficiency. A principle of hierarchy prevails. Lower offices are organized under the command of higher offices. The resolution of grievances and complaints must follow a "chain of command." A "paper trail" of documents commits decisions, proposals, rules, and meetings to memoranda before relegating them to archival storage and institutional memory.

The bureaucratic administrative staff which emerges from a rational-legal authority structure can be found across a wide array of institutions--hospitals, churches, armies, corporations, and political organizations. Weber (1947) writes about the technical superiority of the bureaucratic organization,

Precision, speed, unambiguity, knowledge of files, continuity, discretion, unity, strict subordination, reduction of friction and of material and personal costs--these are raised to the optimum point in the strictly bureaucratic administration..." (p. 337)

Weber asserted that the bureaucratic machine is self-perpetuating because the structural apparatus is based on expert training, specialization, and an efficient mastery of relatively uncomplicated functions which subsequently become integrated into more complex tasks. The structure is stable and easily accommodates changes in personnel.

He asserted that the rational-legal authority structure which gives rise to a bureaucracy is efficient, disciplined, stable, long lasting, and technically superior to any other form of administrative organization.

Representative, Mock, and Punishment-centered Bureaucracies

Gouldner (1954) studied the organization of a mining company and conceptualized three kinds of bureaucracies. He described the representative form of bureaucracy as one based on mutually-initiated rules, consent, legitimacy, harmonious interactions, and common objectives. "Rules serve the interests of both managers and workers (e.g., safety rules)" (Adler & Borys, 1996, p. 66). A punishment-centered bureaucracy was one in which the rules are imposed on subordinates by either workers (union negotiations) or management (top-down communications). The process is perceived as adversarial. A pattern of grievance-filing would be an example of a worker-imposed punishment-centered bureaucracy. Conversely, management might initiate enforcement of a no-absenteeism rule with the workers. In punishment-centered bureaucracies, rules are crafted to represent values important to only one of the groups; consequently relationships, communications, and interactions are typified by tension, opposition, and conflict.

Mock bureaucracies are typified by external agencies or outside entities that impose directives, rules, and procedures. Because the rules are equally applicable to both management and labor there is a tendency for neither party to identify with the outside agency's goals or objectives. Consequently, the external directives are given scant attention and generally result in non-compliance. The organization experiences little internal conflict or tension because no one has a compelling interest in enforcing the

rules. No one group's values are reflected in the outside mandates. Gouldner provided a mock bureaucracy example by use of a "no-smoking rule" that is imposed on an organization by its insurance company--an external agency. Labor and management each valued their "personal needs" over compliance to the rule. This particular rule did not serve to legitimate anyone's values in the same manner that, for instance, an internally imposed safety rule might have. It was a mock rule because it remained unenforced, except for the occasional surprise visit by a fire marshal--the occurrence of which generated front office warnings alerting all personnel to extinguish immediately their cigarettes and pipes. Gouldner observed that these occurrences actually served to strengthen solidarity between the administration and employees because of a "co-operative effort to outwit the outsider" (1954, p.183). These kinds of bureaucratic formalizations are part of what Gouldner characterized as "indulgency patterns." Rules are lenient and flexible. Management is responsive and worker morale is high. Indulgency patterns function as a significant determinant of job satisfaction, dispose workers to view the organization favorably, and increase trust toward the supervisors.

Gouldner's three bureaucratic conceptualizations, which comprised a rudimentary multidimensional perspective, helped provide the context in which to understand organizational structure as a description on a continuum. This was an evolution beyond thinking about bureaucracies as simply an absent/present ideal type, a development which later allowed for greater empiricism and hypothesis testing,

Apparently, therefore, the sheer degree of bureaucratization was not as important in eliciting complaints about red tape as was the type of bureaucracy. In other words, there are now grounds for suggesting that it is not "bureaucracy" *in toto* that provokes internal tensions, or

complaints about “red tape,” but, rather, that these are more likely to arise when bureaucracy is organized along specific lines; that is, as a punishment-centered pattern. (1954, p. 219)

Multidimensional Notions of Bureaucracy

Hall's approach. Hall (1963) conceptualized bureaucracy not as either/or, but as several dimensions arrayed on continua. He argued that the Weberian unitary construct, or ideal type attributes, are better understood instead as several variables which can be made conducive to measurement. This would allow researchers to determine the extent to which an organization is arranged bureaucratically. Moreover, Gouldner (1950) had noted that the Weberian ideal type model highlights basic tendencies of organizations and is useful for analytic purposes and as a tool for understanding bureaucratic components (Hoy & Miskel, 1996), but that "not every formal association will possess all of the characteristics incorporated into the ideal-type bureaucracy" (Gouldner, 1950, p. 53).

Hall was influenced by Udy (1959) who advocated the widening of the bureaucratic ideal type into a model which made it possible for Udy to pursue an empirical investigation into the interrelationships of both bureaucratic and rational organizational dimensions on a present/absent basis. Udy found that three bureaucratic dimensions (hierarchy of authority, an administrative staff, differential rewards according to office) were positively intercorrelated with one another, and that four rational-legal, dimensions (limited objectives, performance emphasis, segmental participation, compensatory rewards) were positively intercorrelated with one another, and yet the set of bureaucratic and rational dimensions was negatively intercorrelated with one another. Hall used these findings to pursue further an investigation of potential areas of bureaucratic variation.

From a review of the literature, Hall developed the Organizational Inventory, an ordinal measure (five-point scale) of employee attitudes and subjective perceptions of bureaucracy over six independent dimensions which subsequently were arrayed into six scales (1963, p. 33),

1. A division of labor based upon functional specialization.
2. A well-defined hierarchy of authority.
3. A system of rules covering the rights and duties of positional incumbents.
4. A system of procedures for dealing with work situations.
5. Impersonality of interpersonal relations.
6. Promotion and selection for employment based upon technical competence.

Hall found, after administering the six scales to random samples of workers and managers in ten different organizations, that these characteristics were independent and not highly correlated. Moreover, instead of a present/absent dichotomy, an organization might measure high in one dimension, and low in another. The magnitude of the dimensions varied independently. He concluded that "bureaucratic dimensions exist in the form of continua and that these continua are measurable" (p. 34); and "all organizations are not equally bureaucratic, there are undoubtedly a variety of organizational factors that contribute to a variety of organizational types..."

This research supported the view that bureaucracy is more than a matter of kind or type, but it is more accurately a matter of degree or amount. Hall's multidimensional model of bureaucracy emphasized that between organizations, there exist several bureaucratic dimensions which are not dichotomous, but instead exist in the form of continua, and that these dimensions are independent and not necessarily correlated with one another. Further studies would provide the understanding necessary to optimize efficiency and effectiveness in specific rational-legal authority structures.

Measures of bureaucracy in schools. Punch (1969) modified Hall's Organization Inventory scales so that it would be possible to measure more accurately bureaucracy in a public school. Some items were reworded and the total number of items was reduced from 62 to 48. The validity and the reliability of the scales were established before being administered to 48 schools (913) teachers. The results suggest that the bureaucratic structure in schools is a one factor, or unitary, concept. Bureaucracy in public schools is homogenous in terms of four dimensions: hierarchy of authority, rules for incumbents, procedural specifications, and impersonality. If specialization and technical competence are included, then bureaucracy, at best, is a two-factor concept. However, Punch argues against mixing positional and technical authority in this definition because the literature emphasizes the incompatibility of bureaucratization and professionalization. This research supported Hall's (1963) findings that bureaucracy is a continuous variable and that the significant dimensions of organizational structure have been identified.

Isherwood and Hoy (1972) used the School Organizational Inventory (SOI) developed by Punch (1969) and also found that the two factors of organizational authority--positional and technical--co-varied negatively with each other when measured in public schools. The bureaucratic pattern-set of hierarchy of authority, rights and duties of positional incumbents, procedures, and impersonality were interrelated, and the professional pattern-set of functional specialization and technical competence varied together. They found that school organizations sort into a one-factor concept on the basis of four bureaucratic dimensions, and a two-factor concept if the two professional

dimensions are included. The findings of this research and the study conducted by Punch (1969) confirm that similar to corporate organizations, school organizations manifest a tension between bureaucratic and professional sources of authority.

The University of Aston studies. The University of Aston data, gathered over a two-year period from a series of documents and lengthy organizational chief executive interviews in the Birmingham, England area, pursued a factual and objective approach to investigating bureaucratic multidimensionality and were in contrast to Hall's studies, which relied on measurements of subordinates' attitudes and subjective perceptions. Pugh, et al. (1963, 1968) conducted a literature review, investigated, and defined the following structural variables (Pugh, et al., 1968, pp. 73-79):

1. *Specialization*: Specialization was concerned with the division of labor within the organization, and the distribution of official duties among a number of positions. These activities excluded the work-flow activities of the organization.
2. *Standardization*: Standardization was concerned with legitimized procedures to cover all circumstances.
3. *Formalization*: Formalization denoted the extent to which rules, procedures, instructions and communications were written down.
4. *Centralization*: Centralization was concerned with the locus of authority to make decisions affecting the organization.
5. *Configuration*: Configuration denoted the shape of the role structure in terms of counts of positions and ratios of the various classes of employees.

This study attempted to describe and sort the study of work organization and behavior into three levels of analysis. Comparative data were compiled and then intercorrelated from 52 organizations arrayed across manufacturing, municipal, government, and retail structures. From these organizations three independent factors

with strong loadings emerged (Pugh, et al., 1968, p. 89): *structuring of activities*, which describes the amount of standard routines and specialization; *concentration of authority*, the degree to which decision making is centralized and extant in the hierarchical structure; *line control of workflow*, the degree to which primary workflow personnel were able to initiate control rather than abide by procedures.

The University of Aston studies reiterated the findings of Hall (1963) and Punch (1969) that bureaucracies are not simply categorical. Variation exists. There can be several dimensional, and hence, structural, differences between organizations. It is not sufficient to speak of bureaucracy as a unitary concept, or an "ideal type." Bureaucratic dimensions can be operationalized, empirically investigated, intercorrelated and "the establishment of these scales and dimensions makes it possible to compile profiles characteristic of particular organizations" (Pugh, et al., 1968, p. 89). This research contributed to a deeper understanding and more useful application of the bureaucratic construct.

Enabling Structures

Bureaucratic formal procedures include written rules and regulations, job descriptions, procedure manuals, and published policies. In rational organizations formalization produces standardization, clarification of roles and behaviors, and predictability (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Its primary aspects are job codification and rule observation (Hoy, Blazovsky, & Newland, 1983). Additionally, centralization, the other key descriptor of a bureaucracy, has been operationalized as hierarchy of authority and employee participation in decision-making (Hoy, Blazovsky, & Newland, 1983).

Complex organizations depend on objective procedures and an official hierarchical structure in order to function smoothly and efficiently.

Adler & Borys (1996) conceptualized bureaucratic formalization as an “organizational technology” (p. 61) that could be characterized as either coercive or enabling,

....while research to date has focused on the impact of different degrees of formalization, it has paid insufficient attention to different types of formalization. If we interpret formalization as an organizational technology, we can draw inspiration from recent research on the design of equipment technology to differentiate two generic types of formalization-- formalization designed to enable employees to master their tasks, and formalization designed to coerce effort and compliance from employees. The attitudinal outcomes are very different. (1996, p.62)

There is a significant amount of literature which states that formalization in organizations is connected to dysfunctional workplace behaviors such as alienation, low morale, job dissatisfaction, stress, and lack of innovation and motivation (Kakabadse, 1986; Bonjean & Grimes, 1970; Thompson, 1965). This view, however, is challenged by research which suggests that clear and unambiguous procedures can contribute to workplace efficiency and job satisfaction (Jackson & Schuler, 1985; Organ & Greene, 1981; Podsakoff, Williams, & Todor, 1986; Senatra, 1980). Adler and Borys (1996) postulate that “whether the impact of formalization on employees’ attitudes is positive or negative is a function of whether that formalization enables employees to better master their tasks or functions” (p. 61).

Adler (1999) proposed a structural perspective in which organizations are arranged socially from coercive to enabling while simultaneously cross-matched technically from low to high levels of bureaucracy. A coercive, or hindering, bureaucracy is a structure

staffed with leaders who demand both effort and compliance from subordinates, punish deviates, de-skill workers, and leave decision making to the managers. Such an organization evinces top-down, one-way communication, stifles innovation, and reduces job satisfaction (Adler & Borys, 1996; Hoy & Sweetland, 2000). In contrast, an enabling bureaucracy impels employees to master their assigned tasks. This type of formalization empowers workers to think for themselves. It allows employees to discover “best fit” or “best practices.” Problem-solving skills and innovation are emphasized as management allows employees the flexibility and freedom to wrestle creatively with contingencies, unexpected events, and obstacles in an ongoing effort to maintain efficiency and meet organizational goals and objectives. As Blau and Meyer (1971) write,

"The main task of management is not to lay down rules on how to do the work but to maintain conditions in which adjustments spontaneously occur when new problems arise and to protect these conditions from bureaucratic processes of ossification." (p. 59)

Coercive bureaucracies, on the other hand, seek to avoid the unexpected, maintain order, and extract compliance and control over employees. Coercive formalization and centralization result in alienation and lack of organizational commitment (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000).

According to Adler & Borys (1999), social structure (coercive to enabling) and technical structure (low to high) are continuous variables and can be arranged in a two-dimensional design matrix to which four kinds of organizational designs can be described: organic, autocratic, enabling and coercive. Category determinants can be predicated on the context of routine (production tasks) and non-routine tasks (quality circles), problem-solving collaboration, shared control, opportunities for innovation, and employee voice.

Hoy & Sweetland (2001, p. 299) described enabling formalization as composed of the following organizational characteristics: interactive dialogue, fostering trust, learning from mistakes, and facilitating problem solving. These formalizations predispose members to enjoy employment security, cohesive work groups, innovation, minimal employer-employee conflict, and employee participation. On the other hand, coercive formalizations frustrate communication, view problems as obstacles, foster mistrust, punish mistakes, and blindly follow rules. This results in divisiveness, employee insecurity, conflict, layers of control, and limited employee expertise. Hoy & Sweetland (2001) incorporated and combined with formalization the concept of centralization, which captures the idea of a hierarchy of authority, or the degree to which employees participate in the decision making process. The characteristics of an enabling hierarchy are revealed in an organizational structure amenable to problem-solving, cooperation, helpfulness, collaboration, flexibility, innovation, and security. A hindering hierarchy is disposed to employee control, autocracy, and rigidity which can result in alienation and resentment (Aiken & Hage, 1968). This kind of centralization is inclined to extracting disciplined compliance and punishing failure, not the more functional components of centralization such as a hierarchy of guidance, coordination and standardization that is imbued with problem solving, innovation, and trust. Administrators in enabling school hierarchies "use their power and authority to buffer teachers and design structures that facilitate teaching and learning" (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001, p. 300).

Hoy & Sweetland (2001) developed an instrument, *Form ESS* (appendix A), for measuring faculty perceptions of an enabling school structure. One hypothesis they tested was "the more enabling the bureaucratic structure of the school, the greater the extent of

faculty trust in the principal" (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001, p. 311). Through the combined use of *Form ESS* and the *Faculty Trust Survey* (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999), they found support that faculty in schools with enabling bureaucratic structures of formalization and centralization were strongly inclined to trust their leaders (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001) as well as their colleagues (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000).

Finally, an enabling bureaucratic school structure would manifest itself in the character, tone, and voice of its rules. Hoy and Sweetland (2001) found in their research that both enabling formalization and enabling centralization were not independent dimensions, but instead composed a "unitary bipolar factor" (p. 307) which ranged on a continuum. Rules and hierarchy varied together, which means that conceptually, a school bureaucracy existed on a continuum with enabling bureaucracy at one end and hindering bureaucracy at the other end (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000; Hoy & Sweetland, 2001). They advanced the notion of a prototypical enabling bureaucracy which helps rather than obstructs and which is composed of rules and policies which facilitate cooperation, trust, and solutions to problems. Hindering bureaucracies use rules and the hierarchy to extract disciplined compliance, conformity, punish failure, and to strengthen administrative power. Their research (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000; Hoy & Sweetland, 2001) suggests that the effectiveness of teachers is diminished in a coercive bureaucracy because they experience alienation, powerlessness, role conflict, and lack of initiative. Furthermore, this research underscores the importance of rules and hierarchy within school structures, because that formalization and centralization which make for an enabling high school

structure, as opposed to a hindering bureaucracy, also correspond with higher measures of faculty trust in colleagues (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000) and faculty trust in the principal (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001).

Conclusion and Implications

There is nothing inherently dysfunctional about the social structure known as a bureaucracy. Weber (1947) lauded its efficiency and productivity. Goullder (1950), Udy (1959), Hall (1963), and Pugh (1963, 1968) expanded its definition and helped conceptualize bureaucracy as a measurable multidimensional phenomenon, the characteristics of which they suggested were relatively independent and possessed of variability from structure to structure. Moreover, it has been shown that one of the dimensions of a bureaucracy, formalization, can be an enabling component of an organization's structure: reducing alienation, role conflict, and role ambiguity while increasing job satisfaction and opportunities for self-actualization (Jackson & Schuler, 1985; Organ & Greene, 1981; Podsakoff, et al., 1986; Seeman, 1971; Snizek & Bullard, 1983). Formalization is a tool, or an organizational technology, by which individuals may flourish, solve problems, and achieve goals in a bureaucracy (Adler & Borys, 1996; Adler, et al., 1998; Engel, 1969; Senatra, 1980). Shoneberger (1986) indicated that organizational spans of control, even in highly formalized environments, can be infused with trust. Hoy and Sweetland (2001) discovered that the dimensions of enabling formalization and enabling centralization were not independent of one another. They developed measures for identifying this important factor. Additionally, other researchers have described an enabling bureaucracy as characterized by unhindered communication

and collaboration, or “employee voice” (Adler & Borys, 1996, p. 81). “If you want everyone to have an ownership stake in the change process you must expose them to all the available information” (Blanchard & Waghorn, 1997, p. 69).

Structural components can be crafted in such a way that organizational members have access to problem-solving resources such as professional development opportunities, sabbaticals, collaborations, and technology. Hoy and Tarter (1995) asserted that participative decision-making can be rational and efficient when it is predicated on the collaboration of the not only the experts within an organization, but also those who are affected by the decisions--the stakeholders. Today's schools leaders can accept the challenge and realize higher levels of employee satisfaction, cohesion, and trust by being attentive to adopting those components of formalization and centralization which comprise an enabling structure (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000; Hoy & Sweetland, 2001).

The Press for Academic Achievement

The terms academic press, academic emphasis, and achievement press share similar connotations, and as designations for a specific construct, have been employed somewhat interchangeably in the school effectiveness research. What constitutes an effective school? How is it measured? The research and literature reflect models and theoretical underpinnings comprised of multidimensional, complex variables in a sustained effort to capture the core of scholastic excellence in our nation's schools.

The Coleman Report

A 1966 government report, *Equality of educational opportunity report* (Coleman, Campbell, Hobson, McPartland, Mood, Weinfield, & York, 1966) was one of many large scale, correlational, "input/output" studies. Certain school effectiveness inputs were

compared with standardized test score outputs. This seminal and unsettling report, based on 645,000 students, 60,000 teachers, and 4,000 schools concluded that student achievement was more a product of student/family characteristics and background inputs (such as the school's socioeconomic complexion and teacher's verbal ability) rather than educational facilities, per-pupil expenditures, resources, or teacher/student ratios, "...differences between schools account for only a small fraction of differences in pupil achievement" (Coleman et al., 1966, p. 22). The overarching conclusion of the Coleman Report was that student achievement is predicated on those variables over which a school district had little or no control,

Schools bring little influence to bear on a child's achievement that is independent of his background and general social context...the inequalities imposed on children by their home, neighborhood, and peer environment are carried along to become the inequalities with which they confront adult life at the end of school. (p. 325)

Public schools seemed to be of little matter in reducing inequality. Investing more resources would be of little consequence. Subsequent effective school studies investigated different variables and broader perspectives such as administrative leadership (Heck, Larsen, & Marcoulides, 1990), school climate (Weber, 1971), principal and teacher expectations (Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, & Lee, 1982; Rutter et al., 1979), and basic skills (Edmonds, 1979).

Parochial Schools and the Common School Effect

Coleman and his colleagues (Coleman et al., 1982), as well as Greeley (1982), published two controversial studies which concluded, that in contrast to public schools, Catholic schools produced students who displayed superior cognitive achievement in spite of conventionally disadvantageous constants such as lower class, minority race, and

lower levels of parental education attainment. These findings diverged from the findings of the Coleman Report which suggested that student and family background variables were more accurate predictors of public school student achievement than school variables such as class size, number of books in the library, teacher salary schedules, school resources, facilities, etc. The authors surmised that Catholic schools did a better job of fulfilling the intent of the "common school" ideal, as advocated by Horace Mann, than did the public schools, which were the ostensible heirs of that noble legacy. Greeley utilized data from a large-scale, longitudinal study to arrive at the conclusion that when compared to public school minority students, Catholic school minority students outperformed their counterparts despite their being "thrice disadvantaged: by their racial background, their family educational background, and by their own prior educational achievement" (p. 113).

Despite student and family characteristics, Catholic schools effectively educated its students. Bryk, Lee, & Holland (1993) labeled this phenomenon "the common school effect" (p. 57) and fashioned it into a hypothesis for a study which contrasted parochial school achievement with comprehensive public schools. Through the utilization of hierarchical linear modeling and regression analysis, they found that the following five school variables yielded an achievement effect in the Catholic schools "that attenuates the differentiating effects that normally accrue from personal and academic background" (p. 257): *'student body composition* (ethnicity, social class, prior academic preparedness, school size, and parochial vs. public); *perceived teacher quality and interest in students* (teacher interest, staff attendance and motivation, and teaching quality); *disciplinary climate of the school* (frequency of discipline, perceived safety, appropriate and fair

punishment); *academic climate of the school* (average hours of homework, emphasis on academic work, student attitude toward academic work); and *academic organization* (number of students in academic track, and average number and diversity of math courses taken).’ (p. 258).

The authors embedded into their study four instructive recommendations and implications, based on the results of those parochial schools studied, for fashioning and maintaining an effective high school. They proposed that effective schools have a “delimited technical core, a communal organization, decentralized governance, and an inspirational ideology” (p. 297). The delimited technical core is a core curriculum of which all students are expected to master. This curriculum is animated by tradition and humanism, and its worth and importance are axiomatic and unquestioned. The second recommendation, a communal organization, was achieved through dedicated and consistent faculty involvement in extracurricular activities, a rich religious and moral ethos, and the smaller size of the Catholic schools--all of which combined to help create a close-knit, cohesive, communal school. The authors' subsequent recommendation, decentralized governance, means that significant decisions are executed at the school level, not mandated from higher levels and the central district office. The fairly recent trend toward “site-based management” approximates this structure. Self-governance usually translates into teacher "buy in" and is accompanied, in most cases, by faculty support for implementation of policies, curriculum, and programs. Researchers have suggested that motivational effects associated with the ability to be a participant in the decision making process do in fact include support and commitment to collaborative decisions and also an openness or decreased resistance to change (Hannaway, 1993).

The fourth and last recommendation of Bryk, Lee, and Holland was based on the recognition that Catholic schools attempt to convey an helpfulness and concern based on the Christian ideals of charity, compassion, and humanism. While it is difficult and inadvisable to mirror such an ostensibly theological approach in a public school, an abiding concern for each student's academic success and his development as a valuable, productive citizen can be effectively demonstrated in public arenas as well,

In a positive teacher culture, individual educators believe they are personally accountable for the success of each student. This self-imposed accountability means that teachers accept responsibility for helping each student overcome impediments to success. (Wehlage, Rutter, Smith, Lesko, & Fernandez, 1989, p.135)

The 1993 study and suggestions of Bryk, Lee, and Holland were carefully executed, scholarly, and extensive. Therefore, there is no reason to assume necessarily that any significant, well-crafted research and recommendations emanating from a private or parochial school provenance are not transferable-- albeit with perhaps some slight allowances and modifications--to those students, faculty, and administrator counterparts in the public school arena. The significance of these and subsequent studies is that what transpires in schools can directly affect student achievement. The challenge for educators is to identify these effective practices and implement them correctly.

Effective School Research

Weber (1971) studied four inner-city schools in an attempt to identify those elements which contributed to disadvantaged children achieving effective reading scores. He employed case study and observational methodology to identify several components

of successful urban schools, including administrative leadership; high expectations for student achievement; an orderly and purposeful school atmosphere; an emphasis on reading skills; and regular evaluations of student progress.

Similar to Weber's study, a State of New York study (1974) compared two urban schools comprised of disadvantaged students--one in which the students scored high in reading achievement, and one in which they scored low. The research publication reported that the higher-scoring school was staffed with administrators who were both effective instructional and management leaders, and boasted of a faculty which conveyed high expectations for student achievement. The lower-scoring school had none of these characteristics.

The California State Department of Education (1980) studied sixteen schools, eight of which had improving third-grade reading scores, and eight that had declining scores. They reported that the improving score schools were imbued with a climate of purpose, strong curricular knowledge, high student expectations, teacher training opportunities, teacher accountability, and an emphasis on reading mastery (Purkey & Smith, 1983).

The effective school research findings suggest that effective schools, when measured by student academic achievement, are prompted by a blend of factors: leadership, climate, and expectations (Edmonds, 1979).

Culture and Climate of Effective Schools

Effective schools emphasize a culture of academic excellence, or "academic press" (Goddard, Sweetland, & Hoy, 2000; Murphy, Weil, Hallinger, & Mittman, 1982, p. 22; Newmann, 1997). This culture is nurtured by teachers, their students, and the administration. Suffused throughout their endeavors and activities, stakeholders in

effective schools consistently fashion a vision and focus on student learning, achievement, and high academic objectives. Faculty expectations about students' capacity to master basic skills and from which they are then able to translate their academic success into post-secondary opportunities become part of the school culture and are expressed in school building policies and classroom practices (Murphy et al., 1982). In short, high expectations are translated into faculty behaviors which precipitate student academic norms and self-concepts. Murphy et al., (1982) delineated several examples of school policies and classroom practices that signified academic press (p. 24): Policies which encompass school function and structure are: school purpose; student grouping; protection of instructional time; and an orderly environment. School policies on student progress address issues such as homework; grading; monitoring progress; remediation; reporting progress; and retention/promotion. They further identified classroom practices that convey academic press, such as an orderly, well-managed classroom in which an academically demanding climate is established. Additionally, pedagogical practices are designed to promote student achievement and are coupled with opportunities for students to exhibit responsibility and leadership. It is imperative in this kind of structure that the building principal is able to convey clearly a vision of academic achievement that is buttressed with goals, objectives, and resources which are specific, identifiable, (Hoy, Hannum, & Tschannen-Moran, 1998; Roueche & Baker, 1986) and designed to enrich the students' academic experience and learning (Louis & Miles, 1990). Open communication is essential because student learning outcomes are hindered when the school leadership is perceived as non-collaborative and controlling (Firestone & Wilson, 1985).

Edmonds (1979) asserted that the environments of effective schools are imbued with five important characteristics. These are similar to those cited earlier by Bryk, Lee, and Holland (1993) and include strong, coordinated, principal leadership; an emphasis on basic skills; high teacher expectations; an orderly school environment; and regular student progress evaluations. Later researchers fashioned these properties into a construct they termed *academic emphasis* and employed it as a factor in subsequent studies (Goddard, Sweetland, & Hoy, 2000; Hoy & Sabo, 1998; Hoy & Tarter, 1997; Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991). In another study, the factor *academic press* was conceptualized as

[T]eachers setting high but reasonable goals, students responding positively to the challenge of these goals, and the principal supplying the resources and exerting influence to attain these learning goals. (Sweetland & Hoy, 2000, p. 709)

Sweetland and Hoy incorporated academic press into a description of school climate and considered it a strong predictor of student achievement. A section of their study's theoretical rationale led to the hypothesis that the academic press of the school climate was positively correlated to the freedom granted to teachers to craft decisions about classroom and curriculum issues. Data derived from the study suggested that academic press was related significantly to teacher empowerment (p. 718). Academic freedom and student achievement of this description are tempered indirectly by the kind of decisions that principals execute--such as the articulation of school goals, high academic objectives and expectations, the acquisition of necessary resources, monitoring pupil progress along with effective curriculum outcomes, and the establishment of a safe and orderly atmosphere (Heck, Larsen, & Marcoulides, 1990; Huberman 1993; Pitner, 1988).

An integral role of the school principal, in addition to guiding the composition and delivery of the curriculum within the organizational structure, is fashioning a climate in which the aforementioned decisions lead to an emphasis upon rigorous academic accomplishments, achievement, and rewards--such that a particular mindset insinuates itself into the normative and behavioral environment of the school (Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan, & Lee, 1982; Goddard, Sweetland, & Hoy, 2000; Newman, 1997). Sergiovanni & Starratt (1993) illustrate a similar culture,

We believe that schools should be understood as learning communities. Communities are defined by their centers. Centers are repositories of values, sentiments, and beliefs that provide the needed cement for bonding people in a common cause...centers express what is of worth to the school and provide a set of norms that guide behavior and give meaning to school community life. (p. 47)

The press, or emphasis, for high academic student achievement influences the norms of a school. Social norms dictate the beliefs and behavior of groups such as students, teachers, and parents. Social cognitive theory states that members of a group will assess themselves and other members relative to the prevailing behavioral group norms (Bandura, 1986), and that social disapproval, and perhaps group sanctions, are possible in cases of members who defect, or fail to support vigorously, the school's quest for academic excellence. In fact, it is likely that the greater the academic press of a school, the greater the normative and behavioral press for superior student achievement (Goddard, Sweetland, & Hoy, 2000). In this kind of climate, collective perceptions built upon academic emphasis tend to shape teacher behaviors, which in turn affect student achievement. This phenomenon has been shown to occur in elementary, middle, and high

school studies (Goddard, Tschannen-Moran, & Hoy, 2001; Hoy & Sabo, 1998; Hoy & Tarter, 1997; Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991). As Lee et al., (1993) state,

The extant research strongly supports the importance of the academic organization of high schools (including course-taking requirements, guidance functions, and policies affecting the assignment of students and teachers to schools and classes within schools). In fact academic organization is the primary mechanism influencing both the average level of student achievement and how that achievement is distributed with regard to such background characteristics as race and class. These statistical relationships are by far the strongest links between any aspect of school organization, either internal or external, and student achievement. (p. 229)

Additionally, Goddard, Sweetland, and Hoy (2000) found that academic emphasis was a significant predictor of differences, or between-school variability, in elementary student achievement scores in both mathematics and reading. Academic emphasis is explained as a facet of school climate "in which teachers believe that their students have the capabilities to achieve, students work hard to succeed and are respected for their academic accomplishments, and the learning atmosphere is orderly and serious" (p. 699). This conveys the sense that within a school climate of academic press, high but realistic student goals are articulated and the quest for scholastic excellence at the student, parent, teacher, and principal level is passionate and unrelenting.

Conclusion and Implications

Student achievement is a multilevel phenomenon, explained by both student/family background variables and school effects. As a construct, academic emphasis--primarily a school effect-- is comprised of elements which defy a simple definition or facile description. Given this complexity, perhaps it is useful to conceptualize it as a particular kind of school culture that gives rise a dynamism of trusting relationships. Collaborations between principal and teacher, teacher and student, teacher and parents, and parents and

students are productive because trust is the foundation of effective communication and cooperation (Baier, 1986). Trust has been described as a work group's generalized expectancy that the words, actions, and promises of another individual, group, or organization can be relied upon (Hoy & Kupersmith, 1985; Rotter, 1967). Trust is functional because it requires less energy than distrust. In an organization such as a school, trusting relationships translate into effective communication and productive outputs such as student achievement (Hoy, Sabo, & Barnes, 1996; Hoy, Tarter, & Witkoskie, 1992).

It is axiomatic that parental influence is a significant, but not absolute determinant of student achievement. Henderson and Berla (1997) state that

[A] student's family is able to create a home environment that encourages learning; express high (but not unrealistic) expectations for their children's achievement and future careers; and become involved in their children's education at school and in the community. (p. 1)

Additionally, parents of high-achieving students assist their children's academic performance by becoming informed as to the school's schedule and activities. They strive for equilibrium and a careful balance between their child's academic and leisure commitments, and they have a direct effect on a child's achieving higher grades (Fehrmann et al., 1987). This effect holds true even in the case of disadvantaged and minority families (Ginsburg & Hanson, 1986). Moreover, Murphy et al., (2001) assert that trust is fundamental in these relationships because

[S]tudents need to trust their parents and teachers to help them make appropriate academic decisions. Parents need to trust that educators are working toward the shared goal of helping their children succeed. (p. 213)

Research has shown a positive relationship between a school culture of academic press and teacher (faculty) perceptions of trust in both parents and students (clients). Hoy,

Smith, and Sweetland (2000) conceptualized achievement press as one aspect of school health and hypothesized that faculty trust in clients was "pivotal for success in achievement" (p. 12). They found that as a characteristic of school climate, the academic press variable stood alone as a strong predictor of faculty trust in clients. Essentially, according to the research, it would appear that the relationship between academic emphasis and student achievement incorporates a moderating variable--faculty trust in clients. Schools which can boast of parents who consistently collaborate with their children and their teachers, and who promote high standards and continuous school improvement, find that their efforts are a necessary but not sufficient component of student achievement. Trust is strengthened in this embrace of open collaboration, commitment, and excellence that teacher/student, teacher/parent, parent/student relationships combine so uniquely to produce.

Teacher Professional Orientation

A profession embodies four definitive components: knowledge, regulation, ideology, and association (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). Professionals submit themselves to extensive university training in an effort to master a body of knowledge that is codified, proven, and dynamic. This "powerful knowledge" (Barber, 1983) is based on "generalized and systematic theory...and has important consequences for systems of human action" (p. 138). Professionals are specialists and experts inside their fields; their expertise is not intended to be necessarily transferable to other areas, consequently they claim no especial wisdom or sagacity outside their specialties. The guild or collegium

historically had guided and sanctioned the professional in his practice (Sykes, 1999). This arrangement enabled a "social compact" to develop between a profession and the public it serves "at the heart of which is trust" (Sykes, 1999, p. 227).

The adherent to a profession is expected to regulate himself and to internalize and subscribe to an ideological standard of ethics, behavior, and moral deportment. His behavior also is regulated both informally and formally by others in the profession. It is in the collective interest of the professional's colleagues that he uphold a code of conduct, a certain level of competence, and adopt a deportment of responsible autonomy. This shields each member from public contumely and protects the investment of money and time expended in the pursuit of each member's lengthy education. To this end, professional boards and peer review policies help ensure that the public, who depend on the knowledgeable rendering of service by the professional, is served by skillful, autonomous practitioners who place the interest of the client above their own.

Professional organizations allow members of a field to associate with one another for the purpose of communicating new technical developments, significant legislation, and political mobilization. These specialty associations and groups also provide important opportunities to socialize informally and exchange problem-solving strategies, give encouragement, relieve stress, and create cohesion and productive relationships.

Professional teacher behavior has been described as "respect for colleague competence, commitment to students, autonomous judgement, and mutual cooperation and support for colleagues" (Hoy & Miskel, 1996, p. 144). Research has suggested that teacher professionalism is related to higher levels of colleague trust and teacher morale (Hoy, Hannum, & Tschannen-Moran, 1998; Smith, Hoy, & Sweetland, 2001; Sweetland

& Hoy, 2000). Little (1990) identifies satisfactory teacher/student relationships as one prominent motivator for impelling teachers to pursue professional development.

Professional development and national board certification for teachers have become salient issues as demands for student achievement, outcome testing, and resource accountability emerge from the public and its legislators. Teachers can avail themselves of several national, local education, and subject matter organizations of which many of their peers are affiliated, and which provide valuable opportunities for collaboration and professional support.

Cosmopolitan vs. Local Orientation

Weber has been criticized for a contradiction in a facet of his work concerning bureaucracy. Gouldner (1954) writes, "On one side, it was administration based on expertise; while on the other, it was administration based on discipline" (p. 22). Gouldner points out an inherent tension, or conflict, in Weber's model; that is, bureaucratic administrators are generally less qualified to make decisions and possess informed judgements in regard to those considerations which require technical expertise and knowledge--that is the expert's unique bailiwick. The power to execute important organizational decisions, however, is determined by the administrator's occupying an elevated place in organizational hierarchy, a prerogative denied the subordinate, despite his possibly greater expertise, superior technical familiarity, and understanding. This generally is cause for dissonance, and accounts for the expert's tendency to identify and exercise greater allegiance with his professional peers outside the organization than with an hierarchical structure circumscribed with inflexible rules, policies, and procedures. Unlike the company man, the expert primarily is validated by his peers and pursues

knowledge professionally outside the organization (Gouldner, 1957). His dual frame of reference--organizational and professional--affects his commitment, loyalty, and opportunities for advancement. From the viewpoint of an organization, goal attainment is predicated substantially upon employee cooperation and loyalty. External reference group orientations can translate into conflicting norms and competing priorities. Consequently, while the organization recognizes the importance of the technical expert, he fails to elicit its complete confidence. Gouldner's ideas are an extension of Reissman's (1947) "functional bureaucrat," who, like the "expert," derives satisfaction from the esteem and recognition he enjoys as a result of his involvement in professional groups outside of the organization; consequently he holds allegiance to the ideals of the profession over that of the employing organization. Gouldner (1957) defined two organizational identities--cosmopolitan and local--which he based on variables such as loyalty to the organization, reference group orientations, and adherence to a set of expert or specialty skills,

Cosmopolitans: those low on loyalty to the employing organization, high on commitment to specialized role skills, and likely to use an outer reference group orientation.

Locals: those high on loyalty to the employing organization, low on commitment to specialized role skills, and likely to use an inner reference group orientation. (p. 290)

In an organization, the expert generally will assume the attributes of the cosmopolitan, and the bureaucrat that of the local. Gouldner (1957) notes that Weber's idea that structural expertise naturally leads to efficiency overlooks the tension between the bureaucratic need for both expertise and loyalty.

Upward mobiles, indifferents, and ambivalents. Presthus (1978) postulated that locals, in response to the anxieties and pressures of the bureaucratic structure, gravitate to one of three accommodations: upward mobile, indifferent, or ambivalent.

Upward mobiles internalize those values conducive to promotion within the organization. Hard work, commitment, loyalty to the status quo, and pursuit of organizational goals reflect the upward mobile's drive to acquire status and authority within the structure. This mode of accommodation contrasts with the more commonly found indifferent, who withdraws from any prospect of finding satisfaction within the organization and finds meaning instead in activities and interests outside work. The indifferent is unconcerned with the organization's vision and rejects the dogged pursuit of status and power. Finally, the ambivalent accommodates bureaucratic pressures inappropriately because his conflict over internalizing and pursuing organizational values versus withdrawing in the fashion of the indifferent is rooted in neurosis and maladaptive behaviors. Usually individualistic and anxious, ambivalents desire status and authority, but haven't the force of will or extroverted personality sufficient to acquire the trappings of organizational success. Presthus thought, however, that the ambivalent's role in the organization could be positive because his criticism and innovative impulses would keep the necessity for change in the forefront.

Professional and Bureaucratic Priorities

Blau & Scott (1962), in their seminal work, recast the cosmopolitan/local types as that of professional/bureaucratic orientations. Professional experts and disciplined bureaucrats, by virtue of their occupying a position in the organization, share, to an

extent, certain behaviors. Both base their considerations and decisions upon objectivity, impartiality, and abstract principles; they each are detached and rational in dealing with clients; and their status and advancement depend on their performance.

However, there are some significant differences between the two orientations. In an organization, professional values and bureaucratic expectations can conflict in several areas. For example, the professional affiliates himself with groups outside of the organization rather than the organizational hierarchy. He allows himself to be guided and controlled by his colleagues or social reference groups rather than the hierarchy. As such, his decisions are marked by autonomy rather than the disciplined compliance of the bureaucrat who practices abeyance to the authority structure and subjects himself to the control and discipline of the prevailing hierarchy. The bureaucrat's "performance is controlled by directives received by one's superiors rather than by self-imposed standards and peer-group surveillance, as is the case among professionals" (Blau & Scott, 1962, p. 63). Additionally, another source of tension is that the professional is "bound by a norm of service and a code of ethics to represent the welfare and interests of his clients" (Blau & Scott, 1962, p. 244), while the impetus of the bureaucrat is to promote the interests of the organization--even to the extent of subordinating the interests of the client, if necessary. Finally, the authority of the professional is derived from his expertise, while the bureaucrat is empowered and vested by the organization, and so it is normative for him to demonstrate stability, subordination, and loyalty (Hoy & Miskel, 1996).

The inability to predict or explain events frequently gives rise to feelings of uncertainty, and each orientation responds differently to this experience. Blau and Scott (1962, p. 247) write, "professional expertness and bureaucratic discipline may be viewed

as alternative methods of coping with areas of uncertainty." An adherent to the disciplined approach will be inclined to circumscribe and limit his scope of uncertainty. The bureaucrat might resort to legalistic interpretations of policies and rules, and refuse to respond creatively or with innovation to unfamiliar questions or circumstances. While this approach provides him with a sense of stability, it affects his ability to solve problems. Conversely, the expert is more apt to face uncertainty with knowledge and freedom of action. He approaches uncertainty as an opportunity to utilize his knowledge, tools, and skills. He enjoys collaborating and sharing with his colleagues either inside or outside the organization, especially when confronted with a particularly vexing problem, and perhaps also when he has mastered, with elegance and perseverance, a difficult conundrum. Given some organizational flexibility, it is possible to accommodate teachers and help resolve professional/bureaucratic conflicts, through the incorporation of such practices as self-governance (Wehlage et al., 1989), autonomy (DiPaola & Hoy, 1994), and site-based management school structures instead of centralized administrative directives and mandates.

A dual orientation. Kornhauser (1962) studied research scientists and suggested that an effective and complex organization relies on a diversity of orientations. In an industrial research organization, Kornhauser noted that it is necessary to "produce technical results; administer the conditions under which the technical results are produced; and apply and communicate those results" (p. 122). He found that each organizational function aligned itself with a particular orientation. The producers of

technical research were found to possess a professional orientation, while the administrators adopted an organizational orientation, and those who applied and communicated research were of a "mixed" orientation.

Glaser (1965) studied research scientists through the use of surveys and reported that a dual orientation, or the *local-cosmopolitan* scientist, was a product of shared goals derived from both general scientific endeavor and the objectives of a research organization. Certain scientists, by virtue of their high motivation and occupations in an environment "devoted to the institutional goal of science" (p. 250) were inclined to exhibit characteristics of both a local and cosmopolitan orientation. These conditions were precipitated by the scientist's motivation to pursue performance and achievement for the purpose of recognition, which then strengthened and reinforced his endeavors to perform again for the purpose of further recognition--the result being that of a regular cycle of performance and reward. This process, due to a congruence of goals, satisfied both organizational and professional objectives.

Wilensky (1964) developed two indices to measure both professional-discipline and careerist orientations. He found a weak inverse relationship and concluded that there was an inevitable "interpenetration of various bureaucratic and professional cultures" (p. 150). He reported that occupations which are marginally defined as professions, such as engineering, teaching, libraryship, and social work, are more likely to adopt a mixed orientation because their autonomy is compromised by powerful forces such as collective bargaining restrictions and administrative structures.

Kuhlman and Hoy (1974) studied the bureaucratic and professional orientations of first year teachers, conjecturing that they would gradually adopt a mixed orientation.

They refined Corwin's (1966) scale and arrived at the *Bureaucratic Orientation Scale* and the *Professional Orientation Scale*. They found that as the year progressed, beginning teachers became less professional and more bureaucratic in their orientations. The organizational structure of public schools had the effect of socializing teachers to a bureaucratic orientation.

Some members of an organization fail to fit neatly into either an entirely professional or bureaucratic orientation. Explanations for a mixed orientation include a member's role and function in the organization, or structural elements such as administrative constraints and limits on autonomy.

Teacher Self-Governance, Expertise, and Autonomy

Two salient components of a teacher professional orientation are "a demand for autonomy in job performance and a strong voice in decisions and policies" (Hoy, Blazovsky, & Newland, 1983, p. 111). It is manifest in teacher behavior such as respect for the competence of other teachers, dedication to students, autonomous decision making, and mutual cooperation and support for colleagues (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). It has been described as an orientation in which teachers "have ultimate authority over making major educational decisions; organizational rules and procedures are impediments that must be overcome; and the best interests of the students are most important and are best determined by teachers" (DiPaola & Hoy, 1994, p. 84).

The movement to professionalize teachers and redesign their training and work roles is an outgrowth of decades of educational reform, a continuous quest for school excellence, and student outcome standards (Hoy & Miskel, 1996). The professional's status is buttressed with formal knowledge, exclusive technical competence (expertise),

workplace autonomy, supporting norms of professional conduct, and adherence to a client service ideal (Labaree, 1992; Wilensky, 1964). Abbott defines professions as "...exclusive occupational groups applying somewhat abstract knowledge to particular cases" (1988, p. 8). Labaree (1992) frames the bestowal of professional status as a kind of bargain in which the practitioner's technical competence and exclusive knowledge are given in exchange for workplace autonomy and a clear definition of the boundaries of appropriate practice.

Teachers encounter obstacles to maintaining a professional orientation. Structural conditions such as time available to collaborate and develop additional skills, interdependent teaching roles, teacher empowerment, and smaller class sizes (Louis & Kruse, 1995) are not always forthcoming, particularly from an organization that customarily has practiced hierarchical decision making. Teachers must model professional behaviors and continue to promote and pursue vigorously their professional advancement based on expertise--that is, a core body of professional knowledge and research (Labaree, 1992)--and actively demonstrate commitment to increased educational, certification, and licensure standards; participate with viable national and local organizations and review boards; and unfailingly place the interests of the students and parents above their own (Talbert, 1995). Additionally, teacher unions will need to continue to professionalize by instituting greater accountability measures such as peer evaluation, loosened job dismissal and termination procedures, and integrative rather than confrontational collective bargaining accords. It is especially important that school structural conditions allow for two primary characteristics of teacher professional behavior: (1) Teacher autonomy in decision making, or self-governance, with the caveat

that if teachers are to adopt fully self-governing practices, in the form of school-based management for instance, it is advisable that they first acquire sound training in three domains: budget analysis, curriculum and instructional programs, and personnel (Sykes, 1999). (2) An hierarchy which promotes teacher expertise, competence, and specialization while simultaneously reducing the tension of the local/cosmopolitan and bureaucratic/professional orientations.

Teacher empowerment and professional communities. Many of the educational reforms initiated in the 1980s addressed issues such as teacher compensation, standards and accountability, and teacher certification. Emergent with these issues was the recognition that many effective schools sported structures that were unconventionally less bureaucratic, and in which teachers enjoyed high levels of autonomy, self-governance, and community support (Chubb & Moe, 1990; Kruse, Louis, & Bryk, 1995; Wehlage et al., 1989). Specifically, teacher empowerment was enhanced by granting faculty greater democratic control over many policies, procedures, and workplace conditions. For example, instead of the principal, teachers can create the agenda and democratically discuss and vote on issues that typically arise in faculty meetings. Although unconventional, the principal can assume the role of informed facilitator rather than director. Similar arrangements allow teachers to experience both the frustration and satisfaction of school governance. Greater teacher autonomy can be attained by modifying the academic structure to permit the faculty to select and install a curriculum, choose the scope of the course offerings, create flexible schedules which allow for collaboration and professional development, and assume greater control over allocating available resources and applying for grants (Wehlage et al., 1989).

Sweetland and Hoy (2000) found that teacher empowerment in middle schools is related significantly to teacher professional behaviors, academic press, and school effectiveness--as measured by teacher's perceptions and standardized math and reading achievement scores.

An additional structural component thought to enhance teacher autonomy and self-governance is the creation of a school-based professional community (Kruse, Louis, & Bryk, 1995; Murphy et al., 2001) in which collaboration, communication, and dialogue address issues such as shared beliefs, curriculum, and concern for students. Talbert's (1995, p. 72) research found that three dimensions shape teacher professional community, "technical culture (shared instructional goals and beliefs), service ethic (caring and high expectations for students), and commitment to the profession (engagement in teaching)." Kruse, Louis, and Bryk (1995, p. 25) conducted a three year longitudinal study and found that the characteristics of a school-based professional community, "shared values, reflective dialogue, deprivatization of practice, focus on student learning, collaboration" are supported by systemic elements such as time available to collaborate, multiple teaching roles, teacher empowerment and autonomy (site-based and school district management), trust and respect, access to technical knowledge and expertise, and supportive leadership.

Conclusion and Implications

The attainment of professional status is a gradual process attained by way of credentials and degrees, technical expertise, self-regulation, workplace autonomy, and concern for the interests of the client over that of the practitioner. Coincident with the school reform, accountability, and student achievement movements is the teaching

profession's pursuit of recognition as professionals rather than functionaries (Elmore, 1993). This gives rise to an organizational conflict which emerges from such sustained efforts: the tension between professional and bureaucratic orientations. Large scale structural changes and school reform would seem to militate for professional teacher communities marked by collaboration, shared decision making, skill and knowledge updates, and classroom flexibility and autonomy; yet historically school organizations have been characterized by leaders who "seek control, respect for authority, and disciplined compliance to their decisions" (DiPaola & Hoy, 1994, p. 83). The outcome of this conflict will be settled when consensus is reached about which approach is functional to the objectives of the school. Perhaps an equilibrium state will be achieved which accommodates the need for teachers to make professional decisions and school administrators to oversee and convey the tactics and strategies of the immediate and future operations of the school. Such a "dual orientation" or "interpenetration of various bureaucratic and professional cultures" has been advanced by Wilensky (1964, p. 150) and others (Glaser, 1963; Kornhauser, 1962; Kuhlman & Hoy, 1974).

A professionally-oriented community of teachers, defined as it is by shared values, flexibility, communication, collaboration, innovation, an emphasis on improving student achievement, and multidimensional, autonomous roles, suggests that teachers would "deepen their levels of mutual trust and respect" (Kruse, Louis, & Bryk, 1995, p. 31) with one another. Collegial trust is functional to the goals of the organization because it promotes cohesion, improves productivity and efficiency, and is related to school effectiveness (Hoy, Tarter, & Witkoskie, 1992; Zand, 1997). Teachers could confidently employ research-based, innovative strategies without fear of criticism for failing. Such a

functional organizational climate of trust is essential to achieving and maintaining school improvement (Hoy, Tarter, & Witkoskie, 1992), and realizing current efforts to place qualified, competent teachers in every classroom.

Theoretical Rationale and Hypotheses

This study assumes that the three referents of faculty trust are a function of one of the three independent variables. Derived from these assumptions are eight hypotheses, which coincide with the research questions posed in chapter one.

It is assumed that faculty trust in the principal is a function of a particular kind of school structure; that is, an enabling bureaucracy. As noted earlier, an enabling structure is characterized by decentralized, flexible relationships that encourage problem solving, task mastery, intergroup participation, explicit communication and trust (Adler, 1994; Adler, 1999; Adler & Borys, 1996; Adler, Goldoftas, & Levine, 1998; Hoy & Sweetland, 2000, 2001). Formalization encompasses standardized procedures such as written rules and regulations, job descriptions, procedure manuals, and published policies.

Centralization embodies such notions as a hierarchy of authority, chain of command, and decision making procedures. Leaders within enabling bureaucracies are inclined to fashion these two structural components--formalization and centralization--to assume the more vigorous and open elements of cooperation, collaboration, flexibility, task mastery, helpfulness, attention to understanding, and the thoughtful solving of problems and sudden difficulties. In this kind of school structure, stringent and disciplined compliance is eschewed, which research suggests will result in a decrease in worker alienation and an increase in organizational commitment (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000). School administrators in enabling bureaucracies "use their power and authority to buffer teachers and design

structures that facilitate teaching and learning" (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001, p. 300). The faculty and principal are more likely to view policies and procedures as tools, or an "organizational technology" (Adler & Borys, 1996) to solve problems and strengthen the school climate rather than constrain initiative, retain the status quo, and hamper dialogue. Enabling structures are led by principals who practice open communication and collaboration with their teachers, practice authenticity or avoid "spinning the truth," and assist their faculty in the solving of problems (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001). These very behaviors have been shown to positively correlate with faculty trust in the principal at the high school level (Hoy & Sweetland, 2001; Hoy & Sweetland, 2000). Consequently, it is predicted similarly that elementary faculty in enabling school structures will harbor higher levels of trust in the principal than those faculty in hindering, coercive, or bureaucratic structures. Moreover, enabling bureaucracy is the best predictor of faculty trust in the principal because the structural components of a building, that is, its centralization and formalization--are understood as being under the supervision of the principal, and so it follows that when an elementary school organization is characterized as an enabling bureaucracy, faculty trust is directed at that individual who is deemed directly responsible--the principal. Thus, the following hypotheses were generated:

H₁: The level of faculty trust in the principal will be positively related to the level at which the school structure is perceived as an enabling bureaucracy.

H₂: Of the three variables--enabling bureaucracy, teacher professionalism, and academic emphasis--the best predictor of faculty trust in the principal will be enabling bureaucracy.

The second assumption is that faculty trust in colleagues is a function of professional teacher behavior. The concept of teacher professional behavior denotes "respect for colleague competence, commitment to students, autonomous judgement, and mutual cooperation and support for colleagues" (Hoy & Miskel, 1996, p.144). As noted earlier, recent research suggests that higher levels of teacher professional behavior are associated with a faculty that trusts one another (Hoy, Hannum, & Tschannen-Moran, 1998; Smith, Hoy, & Sweetland, 2001; Sweetland & Hoy, 2000). It is probable that such faculty, accustomed to sharing expertise acquired in and out of school, engaging in participative decision making with other members of the school building, working openly with other teachers, practicing cooperation, and the frequent acknowledging of each other's abilities will develop trusting relationships with one another. In this environment, professional teacher behavior is the best predictor of faculty trust in colleagues because it is linked, or has proximity, to those individuals--the teachers, who engage primarily in its practice. It follows, then, that given the condition of professional teacher interactions, faculty trust in colleagues will be affected to a higher degree than faculty trust in the principal or clients. Consequently, it is hypothesized that,

H₃: The level of faculty trust in colleagues will be positively related to the level at which teachers are professionally oriented.

H₄: Of the three variables--enabling bureaucracy, teacher professionalism, and academic emphasis--the best predictor of faculty trust in colleagues will be teacher professional behavior.

This study assumes that faculty trust in clients (students and parents) is a function of academic press. Previous studies emphasize the role of trust and its association with school effectiveness (Goddard, Tschannen-Moran, & Hoy, 2001; Hoy & Kupersmith, 1985; Hoy, Sabo, & Barnes, 1996; Hoy, Tarter, & Witkoskie, 1992). In a culture of academic press, scholastic excellence is emphasized and teachers are accustomed to communicating with supportive parents and motivated, focused students. This facilitates collaboration and a supportive learning culture that is characterized by trust because each of the three stakeholders--teachers, parents, and students--share the same high academic objectives and expectations. They work together to achieve common goals. It is likely that collaboration and communication of this nature are excellent predictors of high levels of trust between teachers and clients. Academic Emphasis is the best predictor of faculty trust in clients because its manifestation requires the active participation of students and parents, as well as teachers and students. Under these conditions faculty trust in clients is the nearest, or most proximate, trust referent and the one most affected. Consequently, it is hypothesized that,

H₅: The level of faculty trust in clients will be positively related to the level of academic press in the school.

H₆: Of the three variables--enabling bureaucracy, teacher professionalism, and academic emphasis--the best predictor of faculty trust in clients will be academic press.

Finally, it is assumed that although the three referents of trust each tap a different aspect of faculty trust (Hoy & Kupersmith, 1985), it is likely that all are related significantly to one another; that is, a sort of "trust spillover" occurs. Trust breeds trust, and those teachers, for instance, who trust the principal, are likely to work in an

environment and behave in a manner in which they find it easy also to trust each other as well as students and parents. Indeed, each dimension of faculty trust has been shown to be moderately related to one another (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999). Thus,

H₇: Each dimension of faculty trust will be positively related to one another.

Similarly, it is assumed that the three independent variables will be positively associated with one another. It seems probable that the flexibility, collaboration, and problem-solving found in enabling school structures is conducive to professional teacher behaviors such as cooperation, autonomous judgement, self-regulation, expertise, expanded teacher roles, and empowerment. It is likely that these conditions help create a climate of academic emphasis, which is defined as teachers setting high goals; students responding positively to heightened expectations; a safe and orderly learning environment; parents exerting pressure to maintain high standards; regular evaluations of students; and the principal supplying the necessary resources and efforts to attain those learning goals. The interrelationships of these three variables coalesce to generate the hypothesis,

H₈: Each independent variable--enabling bureaucracy, professional teacher behavior, and academic press--will be positively related to one another.

Conclusion

The eight hypotheses of this study are an extension of the five research questions posed in chapter one. In a departure from the previous section, the following hypotheses shall be grouped by association and prediction:

H₁: The level of faculty trust in the principal will be positively related to the level at which the school structure is perceived as an enabling bureaucracy.

H₃: The level of faculty trust in colleagues will be positively related to the level at which teachers are professionally-oriented.

H₅: The level of faculty trust in clients will be positively related to the level of academic press in the school.

H₇: Each dimension of faculty trust--principal, teacher, and client--will be positively related to one another.

H₈: Each independent variable--enabling bureaucracy, professional teacher behavior, and academic press--will be positively related to one another.

H₂: Of the three variables--enabling bureaucracy, teacher professionalism, and academic emphasis--the best predictor of faculty trust in the principal will be enabling bureaucracy.

H₄: Of the three variables--enabling bureaucracy, teacher professionalism, and academic emphasis--the best predictor of faculty trust in colleagues will be teacher professional behavior.

H₆: Of the three variables--enabling bureaucracy, teacher professionalism, and academic emphasis--the best predictor of faculty trust in clients will be academic press.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This study was quantitative in nature and investigated the relationships of enabling bureaucracy, teacher professional behavior, and academic emphasis on three levels of faculty trust. The three dependent variables were faculty trust in the principal, faculty trust in colleagues, and faculty trust in clients (students and parents).

Because this research was concerned with collective faculty perceptions of trust, enabling bureaucracy, academic emphasis, and teacher professional behavior, the unit of analysis was not the individual teacher, but the school. Correlations among the variables were computed from the mean scores of the aggregated survey items. Subsequent multiple regression analyses were employed to provide a more precise understanding of the data and relationships.

A description of the sample, participants, data collection procedures, variables, and the operational measures, reliability, and validity of the measurement scales ensues.

Sample

The sample for this research was selected from 146 Ohio elementary schools with at least 21 teachers each. A total of 4,069 teachers were surveyed. Since selection was predicated upon the permission of each building's principal, it was non-random. However, the sample encompassed the entire state and included rural, urban and suburban districts of diverse socio-economic compositions.

Participants

Data were collected from teachers and the principal of each building. No teacher aides, substitute teachers, librarians, or school nurses were surveyed. The participants were of diverse experience, age, and gender. No allowances for return visits were arranged in cases of absent or otherwise engaged teachers.

Data Collection Procedures

After acquiring permission from the building principal to administer the survey at a regularly scheduled faculty meeting, a time was arranged either before school or after school. The researcher briefly explained the purpose of the research, requested candid responses, assured the faculty that all responses would be treated confidentially, and informed the teachers that they need not respond to any items with which they felt uncomfortable answering. Each teacher received randomly one of three available forms, and an approximately equal amount of each was distributed at each building. This procedure increased methodological independence of scaled faculty perceptions. Additionally, during this time, the building principal filled out a survey designed for administrators. The explanation, distribution, and administration of the instruments comprised approximately 20 minutes.

Variables

The independent variables were enabling bureaucracy, teacher professional behavior, and academic emphasis. The dependent variables were faculty trust in the principal, faculty trust in colleagues, and faculty trust in clients.

Operational Measures

It was necessary to employ operational measures of the independent and dependent variables for this research. The following sections outline the measure of each variable, examples of the survey items, and a discussion of how validity and reliability were established. The trust variables--principal, colleagues, clients-- are treated collectively because measures¹ for those referents were developed in conjunction with one another (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999).

Hoy and Tschannen-Moran Trust Survey. Hoy and Kupersmith (1985) developed a trust scale which measured the construct of faculty trust in the principal, colleagues, and the school organization. Their operational measures were developed through the use of a 146-respondent pilot study, factor analysis, alpha coefficients, and reliability and construct validity measures. Hypotheses subsequently were generated and a study ensued which yielded moderate correlations among the three trust aspects. The researchers concluded that these aspects are related, but "tap different aspects of trust" (Hoy & Kupersmith, 1985, p. 8).

Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) used the foundation of Hoy and Kupersmith's (1985) scale to investigate an additional dimension of faculty trust: faculty trust in clients (students and parents). They retained faculty trust in the principal and faculty trust in colleagues to arrive at three dimensions of faculty trust. Their definition of trust encompassed an individual's or group's willingness to be vulnerable to another party based on the confidence that "five faces or facets of trust emerged: benevolence,

¹Measures of faculty trust instruments can be acquired from Dr. Wayne K. Hoy, The Ohio State University; Columbus, Ohio.

reliability, competence, honesty, and openness" (p. 186). They developed a 37-item trust scale, or T-scale, which was a Likert scale from one (strongly disagree) to six (strongly agree).

A panel of experts was used to test the content validity of the T-scale, and the face validity was ascertained by use of a field test. A pilot study was done to assess the reliability and validity of the instrument. Next, a factor analysis for construct validation was done on all the items. A high Cronbach alpha reliability measure emerged on each of the three trust referents. Finally, a content analysis was performed to make certain that each of the five facets of trust was represented by the scale items, and the discriminant validity of the measures was established by means of a correlational analysis with extant measures of powerlessness, self-estrangement, and school conflict (negative correlations) as well as teacher efficacy, which as predicted, was positively correlated with each trust subscale. Furthermore, the five facets of trust varied together and "belong to an overall conception of trust that is coherent" (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999, p. 202). The results indicate that the T-scale is a coherent, valid, and reliable measure of faculty trust in the principal, colleagues, and clients.

This study will employ many of the items from the Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) Trust Scale, which includes eight items that measure faculty trust in the principal, eight items that measure faculty trust in colleagues, and ten items that measure faculty trust in clients. The faculty trust subscales are broken down as follows:

Trust in Clients

- ~ Students in this school can counted on to do their work.
- ~ Teachers can count on parental support.
- ~ Students here are secretive.

- ~ Students in this school care about one another.
- ~ Teachers in this school trust the parents.
- ~ Teachers in this school believe what parents tell them.
- ~ Parents in this school are reliable in their commitments.
- ~ Teachers in this school trust their students.
- ~ Teachers think that most parents do a good job.
- ~ Teachers here believe that students are competent learners.

Trust in Principal

- ~ The teachers in this school have faith in the integrity of the principal.
- ~ Teachers in this school can rely on the principal.
- ~ The principal doesn't tell teachers what is really going on.
- ~ The principal in this school is competent in doing his or her job.
- ~ Teachers in this school trust the principal.
- ~ The teachers in this school are suspicious of most of the principal's actions.
- ~ The principal of this school does not show concern for the teachers.
- ~ The principal in this school typically acts with the best interests of the teachers.

Trust in Colleagues

- ~ Teachers in this school trust each other.
- ~ Teachers in this school typically look out for each other.
- ~ Even in difficult situations, teachers in this school can depend on each other.
- ~ When teachers in this school tell you something, you can believe it.
- ~ Teachers in this school are open with each other.
- ~ Teachers in this school are suspicious of each other.
- ~ Teachers in this school have faith in the integrity of their colleagues.
- ~ Teachers in this school do their job well.

Enabling Bureaucracy

The concept of enabling bureaucracy in this study was measured by its two primary aspects: formalization, which includes formal rules and procedures, and centralization, which connotes standardization and the hierarchy of authority. The constitutive definition of an enabling bureaucracy is "a hierarchical authority structure that helps rather than hinders [and constitutes] a system of rules and regulations that guides problem solving" (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000).

In their first two studies, Hoy and Sweetland (2000) investigated the idea that formalization and centralization composed two independent dimensions in school bureaucratic structures. The subsequent factor analysis of 24 items in their first sample, however, did not support the idea of two independent dimensions, but yielded instead a single measure of enabling bureaucracy. The scale showed an internal consistency with a .94 Cronbach alpha coefficient of reliability. Additionally, the construct validity of enabling bureaucracy was supported by a correlational analysis with Aiken & Hage's (1968) centralization and formalization scales. The correlations showed a significant negative relationship with dependence on hierarchy and dependence on rules. In two subsequent larger and more diverse samples Hoy and Sweetland (2001) found that the bureaucratic structures of formalization and centralization varied together on a continuum which ranged from hindering to enabling. They were not independent dimensions, but instead composed a "unitary bipolar factor" (p. 307). Rules and hierarchy varied together in schools.

A more parsimonious measure of enabling bureaucracy developed by Hoy and Sweetland (2001) will be used in this study. Form ESS was pared from twenty-four to twelve items to measure enabling and coercive formalization as well as enabling and hindering centralization. There are six enabling items with positive loadings and six hindering items with negative loadings. This scale showed high factor stability, validity, and reliability. It explained 64.4% of the variance and yielded a .95 Cronbach alpha coefficient. The construct and predictive validities of the ESS scale were demonstrated by

correlation with, and regression on, faculty trust in the principal (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999), truth spinning (Sweetland & Hoy, 2001), and role conflict scales (Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970).

In this study, Form ESS developed by Hoy and Sweetland (2001) was incorporated into research instrument form OSA. The twelve items of Form ESS sort into the following categories:

Enabling formalization items:

- ~ Administrative rules in this school enable authentic communications between teachers and administrators.
- ~ Administrative rules help rather than hinder.
- ~ Administrative rules in this school are guides to solutions rather than rigid procedures.

Coercive formalization items:

- ~ Administrative rules in this school are used to punish teachers.
- ~ In this school red tape is a problem.
- ~ Administrative rules in this school are substitutes for professional judgement.

Enabling centralization items:

- ~ The administrative hierarchy of this school enables teachers to do their job.
- ~ The administrative hierarchy of this school facilitates the mission of the school.
- ~ The administrators in this school use their authority to enable teachers to do their job.

Hindering centralization items:

- ~ The administrative hierarchy obstructs student achievement.
- ~ The administrative hierarchy of this school obstructs innovation.
- ~ In this school the authority of the principal is used to undermine teachers.

Teacher Professional Behavior

In a middle school climate study (Hoy, Hannum, & Tschannen-Moran, 1998), teacher professional behavior was factor analyzed from twelve reliable and construct-valid items of openness and health derived from the Organizational Health Inventory (OHI) (Hoy, Tarter, & Kottcamp, 1991; Hoy & Sabo, 1998). Teacher professional

behavior was defined as "teacher behavior characterized by commitment to students, respect for the competence of colleagues, warmth and friendliness, and engagement in the teaching task" (Hoy, Hannum, & Tschannen-Moran, 1998, p. 342). The four variables which loaded onto this factor were teacher commitment, teacher collegiality, teacher affiliation, and teacher disengagement (negative loading); and the "items measuring each climate dimension were systematically related to one another as predicted; thus, the reliability and validity of the instrument were supported" (Sweetland & Hoy, 2000, p. 716).

The seven items in this study that measure professional teacher behavior were assembled from a recent high school climate and faculty trust research (Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2000). The researchers appropriated the climate measure used in the 1998 Hoy, Hannum, and Tschannen-Moran study and performed a factor analysis to produce the 27-item Organizational Climate Index (OCI) for high schools. The seven items of the construct *Professional Teacher Behavior* are listed as follows (Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2000),

- ~ Teachers help and support each other.
- ~ The interactions between faculty members are cooperative.
- ~ Teachers provide strong social support for colleagues.
- ~ Teachers respect the professional competence of their colleagues.
- ~ Teachers 'go the extra mile' with their students.
- ~ Teachers in this school exercise professional judgment.
- ~ Teachers accomplish their jobs with enthusiasm.

The data were collected and analyzed from 97 geographically diverse Ohio high schools, and the professional teacher behavior items yielded an .88 Cronbach alpha coefficient of reliability.

Academic Press

Like the teacher professionalism measure described earlier, the academic press measures in this research originated from a middle school climate study (Hoy, Hannum, & Tschannen-Moran, 1998). It was factor analyzed from eight academic emphasis scale items composed from the Organizational Health Inventory (OHI) (Hoy & Sabo, 1998; Hoy, Tarter, & Kottcamp, 1991). The academic press items in this research have demonstrated consistently strong construct and predictive validity (Hoy & Sabo, 1998; Hoy & Tarter, 1997; & Hoy, Tarter, & Kottkamp, 1991), providing evidence of a strong independent factor.

Studies which developed the *Organizational Climate Index* (OCI) for high schools (Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2000; Smith, Hoy, & Sweetland, 2001) further refined the Hoy, Hannum, and Tschannen-Moran academic press (1998) items and defined the measure, *academic emphasis*, as

"schools that set high standards for student achievement, have orderly environments, and have teachers who believe their students will succeed" (Smith, Hoy, & Sweetland, 2001, p. 146).

Based on past research (Hoy, Hannum, & Tschannen-Moran, 1998; Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2000; Sweetland & Hoy, 2000) which supports the validity, reliability, and operational measures of academic press, this study incorporated the following eight academic press scale items:

- ~ The school sets high standards for academic performance.
- ~ Students respect others who get good grades.
- ~ Academic achievement is recognized and acknowledged by the school.
- ~ Students try hard to improve on previous work.
- ~ Students seek extra work so they can get good grades.
- ~ Students in this school can achieve the goals that have been set for them.

- ~ Parents exert pressure to maintain high standards.
- ~ Parents press for school improvement.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were computed among all the independent and dependent variables, including means, standard deviations, and ranges. These computations made it possible to ascertain to what extent variability exists.

Intercorrelations were performed among all the dependent variables. This helped provide the answer to the first research question, which asks to what extent the three aspects of faculty trust (principal, colleagues, and clients) are related to one another.

The independent variables also were intercorrelated in an attempt to answer the second research question which asks to what extent structure, professionalism, and academic focus are related to one another.

Data analysis also included intercorrelations between each of the three independent variables and each of the three dependent variables. This addresses research question number three which asks to what extent structure, professionalism, and academic focus are related to each aspect of trust.

The fourth research question seeks to identify the best predictor of faculty trust, and the fifth question asks if each aspect of trust is predicted by a different pattern of independent variables. Each of these questions was answered by the use of multiple regression, which is a multivariate analysis application that is useful for analyzing the variation of the dependent variable as the collective and separate contributions of multiple independent variables are calculated.

Conclusion

Past research suggests that trust is critical for teacher morale, student achievement, and a vigorous and innovative scholastic culture. This study explored three referents of faculty trust (principal, colleagues, and clients) in 146 Ohio elementary schools. The independent variables used were enabling bureaucracy, teacher professional behavior, and academic press. Previous studies, as delineated in this chapter, adequately established the theoretical constructs, operational measures, and reliability and validity of all measurement items employed in this research.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS AND PRESENTATION OF DATA

Data from 146 elementary schools were collected and analyzed to provide answers to the five research questions posed in chapter one and the eight hypotheses generated in chapter two. All six variables in this study--three independent and three dependent--were analyzed by applying reliability measures, computations of descriptive statistics, zero-order correlations, and multiple regressions. Additionally, the three dimensions of faculty trust were subjected to factor analysis. Strong factor loadings helped provide confirmation of the construct validity of the three trust scales.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive computations were figured for each variable (see table 4.1). Ranges, means, and standard deviations were examined and nothing unexpected emerged which would militate against further statistical calculations.

The sample of this study, when compared to the state distribution, deviates somewhat in its representation of urban, suburban, and rural school districts. The state of Ohio has categorized its 612 school districts as 42% urban, 24% suburban, and 34% rural. The 146 elementary schools in this study are sorted at 36% urban, 37% suburban, and 27% rural. The state enrollment mean for year 2001 was 415. This compares to the research sample of 466. The 2001 state SES mean, as measured by the federal lunch

program rate, was .30, and the research sample computed at .27. While this sample is not entirely unrepresentative of Ohio, generalizations should be disseminated conservatively.

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum	Maximum
Enabling Bureaucracy	4.4	.45	3.1	5.5
Professional Behavior	2.8	.20	2.2	3.2
Academic Emphasis	2.8	.25	2.0	3.4
Principal Trust	3.6	.64	1.9	4.7
Colleague Trust	3.8	.42	2.3	4.5
Client Trust	3.9	.58	2.4	5.0
SES	.27	.24	.00	.95
Enrollment	466	142	236	1270

Table 4.1: Descriptive statistics of research variables and demographic data.

Factor Analysis of the Trust Scales

Factor analysis was performed on all 26 faculty trust items (principal, colleagues, and clients) to determine the stability of the factor structure, confirm the construct validity of the scales, and ascertain if the factor loadings were represented by each faculty trust scale as initially expected. Principal axis factoring was the extraction method used and varimax orthogonal rotation was applied to all 26 items.

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
B 24--Clients	.939		
B 34--Clients	.927		
B 7--Clients	.923		
B 20--Clients	.867		
B 1--Clients	.851		
B 14--Clients	.839		
B 23--Clients	.833		
B 31--Clients	.819		
B 50--Clients	.798		
B 13--Clients	-.595		
B 28--Principal		.908	
B 3--Principal		.894	
B 9--Principal		.883	
B 27--Principal		.879	
B 54--Principal		-.872	
B 58--Principal		.860	
B 21--Principal		-.844	
B 37--Principal		-.833	
B 5--Colleagues			.883
B 6--Colleagues			.868
B 2--Colleagues			.859
B 26--Colleagues			.842
B 12--Colleagues			.838
B 17--Colleagues			-.776
B 11--Colleagues			.769
B 33--Colleagues			.526
Eigenvalue	12.909	5.257	2.424
Cumulative Variance	49.7	69.9	79.2

Table 4.2: Factor analysis of the Faculty Trust Scales.

The strong factor loadings, most of which--save for two--were between .76 and .93, suggest a stable factor structure and construct validity for the instrument. There were no dual loadings and each of the 26 trust items loaded as expected. Negative loadings indicate questions which subsequently became reverse-scored items during the process of data analysis. The three factors combined cumulatively to explain 79% of the variance.

Cronbach alpha coefficients of inter-item reliability were computed for each of the trust subscales and yielded very high measures. Faculty trust in the principal was .97; faculty trust in colleagues was .95; and faculty trust in clients was .96.

The factor analysis and Cronbach alpha results support the validity and reliability of the trust subscales when used to gather data on faculty perceptions of trust in the principal, colleagues, and clients. This study employed many items from the Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) Trust Scale, which subsequently served as the basis for a short form (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, in press), and these results provide additional evidence of the instrument's utility when used to measure faculty trust in elementary school settings.

Cronbach alpha coefficients of inter-item reliability also were computed for the independent variables. Enabling Bureaucracy yielded .95; Teacher Professional Behavior was .91; and Academic Emphasis was .88.

Subscale Intercorrelations

Three research questions and five hypotheses were answered by computing Pearson Product Moment Correlations on all six subscales. The questions initially were posed in chapter one:

Question 1: Are the three aspects of faculty trust related to each other?

Question 2: Are the variables enabling bureaucracy, professional teacher behavior, and academic press related to each other?

Question 3: To what extent are structure, professionalism, and academic press related to each aspect of trust?

At the culmination of the literature review in chapter two, eight hypotheses were generated, five of which are appropriate for correlational statistics:

H₁: The level of faculty trust in the principal will be positively related to the level at which the school structure is perceived as an enabling bureaucracy.

H₃: The level of faculty trust in colleagues will be positively related to the level at which teachers are professionally-oriented.

H₅: The level of faculty trust in clients will be positively related to the level of academic press in the school.

H₇: Each dimension of faculty trust--principal, teacher, and client--will be positively related to one another.

H₈: Each independent variable--enabling bureaucracy, professional teacher behavior, and academic press--will be positively related to one another.

In answer to research question one and hypothesis seven, the intercorrelations show that the three aspects of faculty trust are related moderately and positively to one another. Faculty Trust in Colleagues and Faculty Trust in the Principal yielded $r = .61$, $p < .01$; Faculty Trust in Clients and Faculty Trust in the Principal was $r = .32$, $p < .01$; and Faculty Trust in Colleagues and Faculty Trust in Clients was $r = .38$, $p < .01$. All the dimensions of trust--benevolence, honesty, reliability, competence, and openness--are

represented in each subscale. However, each subscale taps a different aspect of faculty trust in the elementary school, and it is appropriate to partition each referent into a measure of either faculty trust in the principal, colleagues, or clients.

Scale	Trust in Clients	Trust in Colleagues	Trust in Principal
Trust in Clients	(.96)*	.38*	.32*
Trust in Colleagues		(.95)*	.61*
Trust in Principal			(.97)*

*Alpha coefficients of reliability for the subtests are denoted in parenthesis.

*p<.01

Table 4.3: Correlations among the Faculty Trust Scales.

Moreover, in answer to question two, and hypothesis eight, statistical computations demonstrate that all three independent variables--Enabling Bureaucracy, Teacher Professional Behavior, and Academic Emphasis--are related moderately to one another in a positive direction. Enabling Bureaucracy and Teacher Professional Behavior are associated at $r = .63$, $p < .01$. Teacher Professional Behavior and Academic Emphasis yielded a value of $r = .50$, $p < .01$, and Enabling Bureaucracy and Academic Emphasis correlate at $r = .50$, $p < .01$.

Variable	Enabling Bureaucracy	Professional Behavior	Academic Emphasis
Enabling Bureaucracy	(.95)*	.63*	.50*
Professional Behavior		(.91)*	.50*
Academic Emphasis			(.88)*

*Alpha coefficients of reliability for the independent variables are denoted in parenthesis.

*p<.01

Table 4.4: Correlations among the independent variables.

Research question three asks to what extent structure, professionalism, and academic emphasis are related to each aspect of trust. Intercorrelations were computed among all six of the variables. Hypotheses one, three, and five were supported. Each independent variable was associated with the correspondingly predicted dependent variable and significance was achieved at the .01 level. While there were significant correlations among all the independent and dependent variables, the hypothesized associations were, as predicted, comparatively more robust. Enabling Bureaucracy was related to Faculty Trust in the Principal ($r = .71$, $p < .01$), Teacher Professional Behavior was associated with Faculty Trust in Colleagues ($r = .66$, $p < .01$), and Academic Emphasis was related to Faculty Trust in Clients ($r = .77$, $p < .01$).

	Trust in Principal	Trust in Colleagues	Trust in Clients
Enabling Bureaucracy	.71*	.52*	.33*
Professional Behavior	.53*	.66*	.32*
Academic Emphasis	.33*	.30*	.77*

*p<.01

Table 4.5: Correlations between the independent and dependent variables.

Correlations of Demographic Data with Faculty Trust Aspects and Independent Variables

Two demographic variables became available in the data collected from 146 elementary schools and were correlated with each of the three dependent variables in order to ascertain if any relationships emerged. Apart from a low correlation between Trust in Clients and School Size ($r = .19$, $p < .05$), there emerged from the data no significant relationship between any aspect of faculty trust and school size. Socio-economic status, however, was significant and correlated negatively with each aspect of faculty trust: Principal ($r = -.23$, $p < .01$); Colleagues ($r = -.34$, $p < .01$); and Clients ($r = -.79$, $p < .01$).

Correlations with the independent variables were run and showed a negative relationship between SES and Academic Emphasis ($-.67$, $p < .01$), SES and Professional Teacher Behavior ($-.29$, $p < .01$), and SES and Enabling Bureaucracy ($-.23$, $p < .01$). The strong negative relationship between SES and Academic Emphasis seems to indicate that as the number of students on a free or reduced-price lunch of the elementary school sample increases, the variable Academic Emphasis decreases with a concomitant reduction in Faculty Trust in Clients. This finding will be examined in the subsequent chapter.

Trust Referent	Sample Demographics	
	SES	School Size
Faculty Trust in Principal	-.23**	.12
Faculty Trust in Colleagues	-.34**	.04
Faculty Trust in Clients	-.79**	.19*
Enabling Bureaucracy	-.23**	.14
Teacher Professional Behavior	-.29**	.06
Academic Emphasis	-.67**	.21**

*p<.05

**p<.01

Table 4.6: Correlations of demographic data with aspects of faculty trust and independent variables.

Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple regression analysis was employed to answer the following research questions and hypotheses. Following are several assumptions that a researcher must presuppose prior to calculations of regression analysis (Darlington, 1990; Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991).

The theoretical model must be specified accurately; that is, the relationship between the factors and criterion must have a basis in reality, thereby minimizing the error component. The inclusion of relevant or theoretically-supported variables ensures against specification errors.

A second assumption of regression analysis is that the measurement of the independent variables is free from error. This results in an unbiased regression

coefficient, and in the case of multiple regression, a coefficient value that is free from underestimation or overestimation. The validity and reliability of the instrument contributes to this assumption, which essentially is one of precision.

Linearity is an integral assumption of regression and signifies that the population means of conditional, or predicted, Y fall in a straight line and are linked through the regression coefficient, or slope, to one-unit changes in X. Put another way, the observed minus the predicted score is the residual, or the amount of error, in the equation. It is that part of the Y score that is left unexplained by the analysis. In addition to the assumption that the residuals (predicted Y) are linear, the expectation also is held that the residuals are not correlated with X; that their mean is zero; that they have equal variances at all levels of X (homoscedasticity); that the errors are independent of one another and uncorrelated; and that they are normally distributed (Darlington, 1990; Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). When these assumptions are not violated, the standard error of the estimate is an accurate indicator of how much error is encountered, on average, if Y is predicted from X. This estimate, as it becomes smaller, reflects the "goodness of fit;" that is, the accuracy of the prediction or how well the regression line fits the data. Scatterplots were run prior to regression analysis to confirm linearity.

Research questions four and five inquire as to what is the best predictor of each aspect of faculty trust, either singly or in combination:

Question 4: What is the best predictor of each aspect of faculty trust?

Question 5: Is each aspect of trust predicted by a different pattern of independent variables?

Additionally, hypotheses two, four and six state that specific independent variables will predict, or explain, most of the variation of specific aspects of faculty trust. The hypotheses are recapped as follows:

H₂: Of the three variables--enabling bureaucracy, teacher professionalism, and academic emphasis--the best predictor of faculty trust in the principal will be enabling bureaucracy.

H₄: Of the three variables--enabling bureaucracy, teacher professionalism, and academic emphasis--the best predictor of faculty trust in colleagues will be teacher professional behavior.

H₆: Of the three variables--enabling bureaucracy, teacher professionalism, and academic emphasis--the best predictor of faculty trust in clients will be academic press.

The research questions are answered sufficiently and the three hypotheses are supported. The best predictor of each aspect of faculty trust when regressed on all three independent variables is as hypothesized above. Enabling Bureaucracy (beta= .65, $p < .01$) explained most of the variance in Faculty Trust in the Principal; Professional Teacher Behavior (beta= .58, $p < .01$) explained most of the variance in Faculty Trust in Colleagues; and Academic Emphasis (beta= .82, $p < .01$) explained a substantial amount of the variance of Faculty Trust in Clients. In each case, the remaining independent variables made insignificant contributions to variability.

Standardized Coefficients (Beta)	Faculty Trust in Principal	Faculty Trust in Colleagues	Faculty Trust in Clients
Enabling Bureaucracy	.65**	.19*	-.03
Teacher Professional Behavior	.15	.58**	-.07
Academic Emphasis	-.07	-.09	.82**
	R=.72 Adjusted R Square = .51	R=.68 Adjusted R Square = .45	R=.77 Adjusted R Square = .59

*p<.05

**p<.01

Table 4.7: Multiple Regression of Faculty Trust.

Multiple regression analysis with demographic variables. The school size and socio-economic status of the elementary school sample were used as control variables and regressed in combination with the three independent variables; that is, each referent of faculty trust was regressed onto enabling bureaucracy, teacher professional behavior, academic emphasis, SES, and school size. The use of demographic variables helps explain to what extent the variation in each aspect of faculty trust is outside the three predictors.

When controlling for SES and school size, there was little or no difference in the figures or the overall contribution to variability of the Faculty Trust in the Principal and Faculty Trust in Colleagues regression analyses. Faculty Trust in Clients, however, evinced a much different partitioning of variation. While the contribution of school size was not a significant factor, socio-economic status explained a moderate amount of variation with a beta of -.48. Its inclusion into the regression equation reduced the contribution of Academic Emphasis to a beta of .48. Moreover, all five variables accounted for 73% (adjusted R Square) of the variation of Faculty Trust in Clients.

Standardized Coefficients (Beta)	Faculty Trust in Principal	Faculty Trust in Colleagues	Faculty Trust in Clients
Enabling Bureaucracy	.66**	.22**	.01
Teacher Professional Behavior	.15	.58**	-.08
Academic Emphasis	-.19*	-.30**	.48**
SES	-.15	-.33**	-.48**
School Size	.03	-.01	.01
	R= .72 Adjusted R Square = .50	R= .72 Adjusted R Square = .50	R= .86 Adjusted R Square = .73

*p<.05

**p<.01

Table 4.8: Multiple Regression of Faculty Trust with Demographic Variables.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the findings of this study supported all eight hypotheses. The negative correlation of SES with Academic Emphasis ($r = -.67$, $p < .01$) and Trust in Clients ($r = -.79$, $p < .01$), as well as the regression of Faculty Trust in Clients on Academic Emphasis (beta= .48) and when controlling for SES (beta= -.48), are findings which will merit further consideration in the subsequent chapter.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Given the current spate of news from business and industry, trust, having been regarded cavalierly, is in short supply. A bedrock of corporate reporting known as *generally accepted accounting principles* has been thrown into disrepute as shareholders and investors wonder when the next earnings report will be discovered to be egregiously deceptive and yet another Chief Executive Officer embroiders his company's performance and joins the rogue's gallery of fiduciary irresponsibility and self-aggrandizement. Names like Enron, World.com, Arthur Andersen, and Adelphia bring to mind corporate fraud, bankruptcy, plummeting share values, and the worst excesses of capitalism since the days of the robber barons. Trust is given scant attention until such a time as it is not made manifest (Baier, 1986). The ramifications of this massive betrayal of trust--which in truth is a financial enormity visited upon the public by the some of the country's most powerful corporate leadership in concert with segments of the accounting profession--will take several years to repair despite the best efforts of our politicians, legislators, and investment institutions. For many years, public education has borrowed generously from the business model: Management by Objectives, Total Quality Management, and the Baldrige Initiative, to name a few. Despite their proven utility,

these various and sundry lapses and corporate malfeasances will probably dispel from the education community its enchantment over these free enterprise models and fashionable tools of productivity and efficiency. Such is the fallout of broken trust.

This study researched three referents of faculty trust: trust in the principal, trust in colleagues, and trust in clients (students and parents). It was hypothesized that three variables would be instrumental in achieving higher levels of those referents of faculty trust in elementary schools. Those variables, in order, are enabling bureaucracy, teacher professional behavior, and academic emphasis. Valid and reliable instruments were assembled to survey elementary faculty in 146 Ohio elementary schools, and this section concludes the research with a discussion of those findings. Included are implications of both a practical and theoretical nature.

Summary of Findings

1. A factor analysis of the trust scales yielded strong, unitary factor loadings. These results supported the stability of the factor structure and construct validity of the instrument. Previously, similar results were obtained in a study of urban elementary schools (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999), and it was from that study that the survey items were obtained.
2. All six variables in this study were internally consistent, as measured by Cronbach Alpha calculations which ranged from .88 to .97. Internal consistency is a characteristic of instrument reliability.
3. As hypothesized, the three trust scales were moderately correlated, with Trust in Principal and Trust in Colleagues showing the strongest correlation ($r = .61, p < .01$). An earlier study found both of these referents to be significantly correlated at the

middle school level (Hoffman et al., 1994), and all three referents of faculty trust were found to be moderately related to one another in two elementary school studies (Hoy & Kupersmith, 1985; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999). It is not surprising that all three referents of faculty trust correlate. As mentioned earlier, trust reinforces itself through reciprocity. Zand (1997) refers to this phenomenon as the spiral reinforcement model of trust.

4. As hypothesized, the independent variables were moderately correlated, with Enabling Bureaucracy and Teacher Professional Behavior demonstrating the strongest correlation ($r = .63, p < .01$). An enabling bureaucracy is defined as "A hierarchical authority structure that helps rather than hinders [and constitutes] a system of rules and regulations that guides problem solving" (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000). Teacher Professional Behavior is defined as an orientation which reflects behavior such as "respect for colleague competence, commitment to students, autonomous judgement, and mutual cooperation and support for colleagues" (Hoy & Miskel, 1996, p. 144). It is not unexpected that a structure which is given over to flexibility for the purpose of solving problems should be associated with a faculty that is committed to academic excellence and entrusted with responsibility and autonomy.
5. A correlational analysis of the independent variables with all of the aspects of faculty trust supported the hypotheses that a positive relationship would emerge. In fact, each independent variable was positively and significantly correlated with each aspect of faculty trust.
6. The demographic variables, SES (identified as the number of students on a federally-funded free or reduced-price lunch) and School Size (enrollment) were included in a

separate correlational analysis with all six variables of the study. School Size associations were insignificant, but SES correlated negatively with all six variables at the $p < .01$ level of significance. The correlations of SES and Faculty Trust in Clients ($r = -.79$, $p < .01$) and Academic Emphasis ($r = -.67$, $p < .01$) were stronger than the remaining variables which ranged from $-.23$ to $-.34$. The interpretation is that as the number of elementary students enrolled in the free or reduced-price lunch program increases there is found a concomitant decrease in the variables enabling bureaucracy, teacher professional behavior, academic emphasis, and each aspect of faculty trust. A discussion of this finding appears later.

7. It was hypothesized that specific independent variables would best predict specific aspects of faculty trust. Through multiple regression analyses, these hypotheses clearly were supported. Each aspect of faculty trust was regressed on all three independent variables. Enabling Bureaucracy best predicted Faculty Trust in the Principal ($\beta = .65$, $p < .01$); Teacher Professional Behavior best predicted Faculty Trust in Colleagues ($\beta = .58$, $p < .01$); and Academic Emphasis best predicted Faculty Trust in Clients ($\beta = .82$, $p < .01$).

It should be noted that a clear causal relationship between the independent and dependent variables is not established. It is probable that the relationship between this study's independent variables and faculty trust is bi-directional; that is, a reciprocal relationship exists in which faculty trust also promotes each of the research factors.

The concept of proximity provides an explanation of why it is each independent variable particularly predicts a specific aspect of faculty trust. For instance, the structural components of a building--centralization and formalization--are associated

with being under the control and direction of the principal, so when an organization is fashioned along the lines of an enabling bureaucracy, the principal is remunerated with a faculty that spends the currency of its trust in him. Similarly, professional behavior is linked with those individuals--the teachers--who engage primarily in its practice. It follows, then, that given the condition of professional teacher interactions, faculty trust in colleagues will be affected to a higher degree than faculty trust in the principal or clients. Finally, this rationale can be extended to faculty trust in clients. Academic emphasis requires the active participation of students and parents, as well as teachers and students, so under these conditions faculty trust in clients is the nearest referent and the one most affected.

8. Multiple regression analysis was extended further to include two demographic variables--SES and School Size. These variables were used as constants to control for their effects. The hypotheses concerning overall best predictors were supported, but the effect of SES became more prominent as Faculty Trust in Clients (beta= -.48, $p<.01$) was regressed on all five variables.

This study, guided by the research questions in chapter one and culminating in the statistical calculations of chapter four, found clear support for all eight hypotheses as posed in chapter two.

Discussion

The hypotheses of this study were supported; enabling bureaucracy is positively correlated with faculty trust in the principal and is the best predictor of that aspect of faculty trust. Furthermore, the same was found for teacher professional behavior and

faculty trust in colleagues and also academic emphasis and faculty trust in clients. These relationships subsequently were examined by holding socio-economic status and school enrollment constant.

Enabling bureaucracy and faculty trust in the principal. An enabling bureaucracy, in brief, is characterized by flexible formal rules and procedures coupled with an adaptive, decentralized hierarchy of authority. This type of structure provides teachers with the freedom to exercise their problem-solving skills. Administrators engage in authentic communication and encourage employees to discover "best practices" and innovative solutions to organizational objectives and goals. Adler (1999) defines an enabling bureaucracy as an organizational structure devoted to those designs that emphasize "usability," rather than "foolproofing" and he writes of a technology that is of an "internal transparency or glassbox design." Principals can choose the organizational structure of their building in either an enabling or hindering manner. When administrators choose to reconfigure the bureaucratic components of formalization and centralization into that of an enabling bureaucracy, it seems that teachers reciprocate by deepening their levels of trust in their leader. Indeed, Hoy and Sweetland (2001, p. 299) aptly catalogue such an environment as one of interactive dialogue, learning from mistakes, facilitative problem solving, cohesive work groups, innovation, high morale, low conflict, and employee participation. This study found support for the hypothesis that enabling bureaucracy and faculty trust in the principal are positively associated, with a correlation of $r = .71$, $p < .01$. This kind of structure also is positively associated with faculty trust in colleagues ($r = .52$, $p < .01$) and faculty trust in clients ($r = .33$, $p < .01$). It appears that in

such a climate, trust "spills over" into the other referents. Multiple regression analysis provided confirmation that the best predictor of faculty trust in the principal was enabling bureaucracy (beta= .65, $p<.01$).

Teacher professional behavior and faculty trust in colleagues. Past research suggests that higher levels of teacher professional behavior are associated with a faculty that trusts one another (Hoy, Hannum, & Tschannen-Moran, 1998; Smith, Hoy, & Sweetland, 2001), and that further, a faculty that is comprised of teachers who trust one another is linked to school effectiveness (Hoy, Tarter, & Witkoskie, 1992). This study predicted a positive correlation between Teacher Professional Behavior and Faculty Trust in Colleagues; and in fact, this was the case ($r= .66$, $p<.01$). There were also a noteworthy correlation with this aspect of trust and Enabling Bureaucracy ($r= .52$, $p<.01$). Moreover, the two independent variables, Enabling Bureaucracy and Teacher Professional Behavior are correlated ($r= .63$, $p<.01$), as is Teacher Professional Behavior and Faculty Trust in Principal ($r= .53$, $p<.01$). Multiple regression analysis, however, suggested that Teacher Professional Behavior was, as expected, the strongest predictor of Faculty Trust in Colleagues at the .01 level of significance at beta= .58, $p<.01$.

Professional teacher behavior denotes "respect for colleague competence, commitment to students, autonomous judgement, and mutual cooperation and support for colleagues" (Hoy & Miskel, 1996, p.144). Teachers who adopt these practices most likely are accustomed to pursuing frequent opportunities for professional development. Most professional development workshops, classes, and conferences emphasize participative decisionmaking and collaborative interaction with other teachers. It would be natural for such teachers to perceive higher levels of trust with their colleagues as they

practice what they've learned in their respective elementary buildings. Thus, the research hypotheses of this study, not unexpectedly, were confirmed. A significant correlation of this aspect of faculty trust with enabling bureaucracy might be explained by noting that in the case of a flexible, decentralized, problem-solving organizational structure, the conditions would arise to impel a staff to become more professional, cooperative, and autonomous in its orientation and relationship with the principal. This would explain the significant correlations of this referent of faculty trust with Enabling Bureaucracy and Trust in Principal.

Academic emphasis and faculty trust in clients. As predicted, there was a strong correlation between Academic Emphasis and Faculty Trust in Clients, and multiple regression analysis indicated that Academic Emphasis was the best predictor--with a strong, independent effect at the .01 level of significance--of that aspect of faculty trust. This result also was found in a previous high school study (Smith, Hoy, & Sweetland, 2001). Additionally, a previous elementary school studies also found that Academic Emphasis is associated with Faculty Trust in Clients (Goddard, Sweetland, & Hoy, 2000).

This finding is of practical significance in light of a study which found that academic emphasis is instrumental in attaining higher standardized reading and math scores in urban elementary schools (Goddard, Sweetland, & Hoy, 2000). In combination with the finding of this study, it would seem likely that higher levels of academic emphasis are correlated with higher levels of faculty trust in clients and perhaps an outgrowth of these associations is student academic achievement--which, after all, is the objective of an organizational culture of academic emphasis. A recent study suggests that faculty trust in clients is a positive predictor of student achievement in urban

elementary schools (Goddard, Tschannen-Moran, & Hoy, 2001). As noted in chapter two, within a culture of academic emphasis, scholastic excellence is emphasized and teachers are accustomed to communicating with supportive parents and motivated, focused students. This facilitates collaboration and a supportive learning culture that is characterized by trust because each of the three stakeholders--teachers, parents, and students--share the same high academic objectives and expectations. They work together to achieve common goals.

The interplay of demographic variables. Additional correlational and multiple regression analyses were calculated with the inclusion of two constants or control variables: School Size (student enrollment) and SES (the number of students enrolled in the federal free or reduced-price lunch program).

School Size yielded no correlations or regression figures of significance, but SES was correlated negatively with every independent and dependent variable in this study--particularly Faculty Trust in Clients ($r = -.79, p < .01$) and Academic Emphasis ($r = -.67, p < .01$). Moreover, Faculty Trust in Clients ($\beta = -.48, p < .01$) and Faculty Trust in Colleagues ($\beta = -.33, p < .01$) regressed negatively onto SES at the .01 level of significance. An examination of these elementary schools reveals that as the number of students enrolled in the federal lunch program increases, Faculty Trust in Clients and Academic Emphasis are found to decrease commensurately. Academic Emphasis is defined as "teachers setting high but reasonable goals, students responding positively to the challenge of these goals, and the principal supplying the resources and exerting influence to attain these learning goals" (Sweetland & Hoy, 2000, p. 709). It is likely that teachers in lower socio-economic elementary schools do not conduct their work in

buildings in which the culture and the elements of academic emphasis are prevalent. It could be that district resources are scarce, buildings ill-equipped, and that the administration and faculty lack confidence in the ability of their students. Moreover, students from disadvantaged backgrounds are not likely to experience a home curriculum rich in literacy and technology; they have fewer exposures to enriching experiences, and their parents are more likely not to be fully proficient in reading, math, or speaking English. Consequently, two item measures of Academic Emphasis--parental exertion to maintain high standards and parental press for school improvement--probably would be manifest diffidently. It is possible that these background deficiencies--coupled with the students' probable lapses in the areas of nutrition, hygiene, medical care, and social services--command the immediate attention of the faculty and administration, shape their attitudes and expectations, and have the unhappy effect of relegating academic emphasis--already attenuated in the home-- to secondary status in the classroom. In this milieu, faculty interactions with students and parents would assume a cast not particularly collaborative or conducive to generating high levels of client trust.

Practical Implications

Trust in schools is integral because among other things, it is vitally important in establishing effective communication and morale among individuals in an organization (Hughes, 1974; Zand, 1972). This study reiterates the utility of the Hoy and Tschannen-Moran Trust Survey (1999) when applied to the faculty of elementary schools, and identifies the five facets of trust--benevolence, reliability, openness, competence, and honesty--for those administrators, teachers, and parents interested in promoting those dimensions in their interactions with one another.

Administrators interested in increasing higher levels of faculty trust in the principal can direct their efforts along the lines of an enabling bureaucracy by familiarizing themselves with items from the ESS (enabling school structure) instrument. Descriptions of enabling and hindering organizational structures (which conceptually is a continuum) can be derived from either one of the two primary bureaucratic components--formalization or centralization--to fashion an elementary school given over to "best fit" and "best practices" (Adler, 1996), flexibility, problem-solving, collaboration, cohesion, and interactive dialogue (Hoy & Sweetland, 2000, 2001).

Similarly, administrators and faculty can encourage teachers routinely to trust one another by becoming aware of what it is that constitutes teacher professional behavior. This orientation is characterized by teachers who support, respect, and cooperate with one another while executing their duties with enthusiasm, competence, and autonomy. For diagnostic purposes, the overall measure and the individual items of teacher professional behavior have been clearly delineated for the practitioner, and he or she can be confident in their employment in this and previous studies. Such is the case for each of the six variables in this study.

The measure of academic emphasis in this research originated from a middle school climate study (Hoy, Hannum, & Tschannen-Moran, 1998) and has been refined in other research (Smith, Hoy & Sweetland, 2000; Sweetland & Hoy, 2000). This study suggests that administrators who practice strong, coordinated leadership coupled with a cadre of teachers who regularly emphasize basic skills, high expectations, an orderly and purposeful environment, regular student evaluations, and the consistent monitoring of

academic progress (Edmonds, 1979) can establish a synergy of trust and collaboration with students and parents. Such a dynamic climate increases the likelihood of improved student achievement.

This study gives rise to some practical suggestions for administrators, teachers, students, and parents:

1. Administrators may increase levels of faculty trust in the principal by exercising flexible, adaptive organizational behaviors which demonstrate a commitment to solving problems. Mistakes should be cast as opportunities for learning. Formal rules and procedures optimally are regarded as documents perennially subject to change and modification. Faculty can be informed that positional authority can flow both ways and that an efficient organization supersedes in importance hierarchical placement.
2. Principals can begin to fashion an enabling bureaucracy in their buildings by signifying that the purpose of school rules is to assist in the search for solutions. Hindering rules, red tape, and rigid procedures must give way to professional judgement when searching for solutions in an organization.
3. An administrative hierarchy that it is not punitive, but instead allows for innovation, articulation of the school's mission, and student achievement will reflect a school structure that is enabling as opposed to hindering. This study indicates that faculty trust in the principal may be affected positively by enabling centralization.
4. A cadre of trusting, supportive, enthusiastic, and collegial teachers can be fashioned by school districts and administrators who emphasize faculty professional

development. These opportunities for learning can be provided with the expectation that new knowledge is to be disseminated among the school faculty within a context of "best practices."

5. Parents should be encouraged to become involved regularly in the academic activities of the school. Volunteer tutoring, family reading and math nights, library book drives, and parent teacher organizational meetings are excellent starting points, but it is incumbent upon the administrators and teachers of an elementary school to ensure that parents, in concert with their children, feel free to immerse themselves into the life of the school and thereby contribute to a shared culture of academic emphasis. This study suggests that collaboration of this nature may heighten levels of faculty trust in parents and students.
6. This study suggests that elementary building administrators whose objective is one of academic emphasis will find it advisable to set high, but achievable, standards for academic performance. Student achievement should be recognized and celebrated. A likely consequence of this approach, apart from a culture of academic excellence, is a faculty that trusts its clients.
7. Teachers can contribute to a culture of academic emphasis and its attendant levels of increased client trust by allowing students to improve on previous work, emphasizing the importance of good grades, and engaging parents in the scholastic work of their clients.
8. Students can help create an environment of academic emphasis by encouraging their peers to acquire good grades, trying hard to improve on previous work, and seeking

extra work as a means to achieving higher marks. These kinds of efforts are likely to result in teachers exhibiting higher levels of trust in their students.

These practical implications may serve as a beginning to administrative practice and further research investigations into the dynamics of faculty trust as it corresponds and is initiated by enabling bureaucracy, teacher professional behavior, and academic emphasis.

Research Implications

Although previous research has investigated the referents of faculty trust (Hoy & Kupersmith, 1985; Hoy & Kupersmith, 1986; Hoy, Tarter, & Witkoskie, 1992; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Sweetland & Hoy, 2000; Smith, Hoy, & Sweetland, 2001), a unique combination of factors was employed in this study--enabling bureaucracy, teacher professional orientation, and academic emphasis--which suggests rich avenues for further research. These possibilities give rise to several questions:

1. To what extent is faculty trust in colleagues related to the professional development opportunities outside the building? Inside the building and/or district inservices?
2. Do teachers who have previously experienced high levels of faculty trust in the principal, upon moving into the principalship, transfer those skills and strategies they've encountered into fashioning a structure of enabling bureaucracy?
3. Does the relationship between enabling bureaucracy and faculty trust in the principal "spill over" to faculty trust in the superintendent and central office administrators, despite their frequently not being found in the elementary building?
4. To what extent is it possible to have a structure of enabling bureaucracy at the building level and not at the district level?

5. To what extent are there differences in the organizational structure of an elementary school as opposed to a high school that might impact upon the creation of an enabling bureaucracy? Would research uncover differences in the orientation of the faculty to rules and hierarchy?
6. Does the relationship between academic emphasis and faculty trust in clients emerge at the middle school and high school levels? If so, to what extent?

Subsequent investigations, having been grounded in the educational research literature, might explore other predictors at each variant of trust. It seems likely that characteristics which relate to the leadership behavior of the principal are most clearly and directly related to faculty trust in the principal; hence, the following hypotheses are offered:

1. Those elementary principals with a collegial leadership style will accrue higher levels of faculty trust than those who display a directive style.
2. Elementary principals who are transformational leaders will have higher levels of faculty trust than those who are transactional leaders.
3. Elementary principals who practice authenticity in their interactions with teachers will register higher levels of faculty trust than those administrators who do not attend to this practice.

Similarly, characteristics of teacher-teacher interactions seem most closely related to faculty trust in colleagues; therefore, the following predictions are proposed:

4. Open teacher-teacher relations will be positively associated with faculty trust in colleagues; that is, the more open the relationships, the stronger the faculty trust in colleagues.

5. The greater the degree of organizational citizenship in a school, the greater the faculty trust in colleagues.
6. The cohesiveness of the school faculty will be positively related to faculty trust in colleagues.

Finally, those characteristics that most directly are associated with students and parents will be strong predictors of faculty trust in clients; thus the following hypotheses are adduced:

7. As parental involvement in school activities increases, faculty trust in clients will increase.
8. As teacher participation in student extracurricular activities increases, faculty trust in clients will increase.
9. Schools in which there is a high degree of student bullying will have lower levels of faculty trust in clients than schools with a low degree of bullying.

Conclusion

Except for the most Machiavellian among us, trust indisputably is preferred to distrust. We sense that it promotes harmony and reduces conflict. This study contributes to this intuitiveness a glimmer of objective confirmation. These findings suggest that faculty trust in elementary schools is associated with teacher professional behavior, academic emphasis, and a bureaucratic structure which is enabling as opposed to hindering. For educators, recognition of the incomparable value of organizational trust is the first phase. This study identifies, as the second phase, three components worthy of consideration in those elementary buildings where efforts are being directed to induce higher levels of teacher trust in the principal, other teachers, students, and parents.

APPENDIX A
RESEARCH PROSPECTUS

Social Dynamics in Elementary Schools
Research Prospectus

Wayne K. Hoy

Jeffrey R. Geist

Jana Alig-Mielcarek

Mike Nicholson

James Sinden

The Ohio State University

I. Problem Statement

The purpose of this research is to explore the relationships between organizational health, school structure, principal leadership, and faculty trust. Additionally, we will investigate the extent to which organizational climate, leadership, and structure are related to feelings of efficacy among the faculty and student achievement. This study makes important theoretical advances in the measurement of, and interrelationships among, these constructs, as well as important contributions to our knowledge of school effectiveness and equity. This study is a replication and follow-up to a research project completed in 100 high schools in Ohio.

II. Procedures

A. Design: This study is a quantitative investigation using three survey instruments that have been developed as a part of this project. In addition, principals will be asked to respond to a principal questionnaire. Data will be collected from a diverse sample of schools in Ohio representing urban, suburban, and rural districts throughout the state.

B. Data and Collection: Once approval has been received from building principals, we will request 15 minutes of time at a regularly scheduled faculty meeting or early release professional development date during November through March 2002 to administer the surveys to faculty. The researcher administering the surveys will explain the purpose of the study, assure confidentiality, and request that teachers complete the surveys in as candid a manner as possible. Faculty will be advised that they do not need to respond to any item that they are not comfortable answering. There are three alternating forms of the questionnaire. One-third of the teachers present will respond to

each. Splitting the faculty into three groups ensures that the data collection will be done in 15 minutes. The responses to the questionnaires will be anonymous; no identifying marks will indicate which teachers have completed which questionnaires. Questions concerning demographic information about the school, such as number of students, racial and socioeconomic characteristics of the students (but not the school's name or address), will be included for the principal to complete along with a principal questionnaire. A sample of one of the questionnaires is attached.

C. Data Analysis: We are interested in the collective; the patterns, practices, and processes of interpersonal relationships within a school. Data on structure, climate, leadership, efficacy, and achievement will thus be aggregated at the school level. Our interest is in the relationships between the constructs. Individual school scores in most cases will not be calculated. If they are calculated, results will be kept strictly confidential.

D. Time Schedule: We intend to begin data collection in November 2001. Faculty questionnaires will be administered in November through April. Data analysis will begin in May. A general report of the results will be available in September.

III. Reporting and Dissemination

This research project will provide the foundation for several doctoral student dissertations in the College of Education at The Ohio State University. The dissertations will focus on the relationships between leadership and efficacy as well as to student achievement. Executive summaries of the results will be provided to schools for dissemination to the professional staff. Additionally, the data obtained in this study will also be used to produce manuscripts for publication in scholarly journals. The

findings of these studies will also be presented at professional meetings. The Human Subjects Institutional Review Board at The Ohio State University has reviewed the research application and has given approval to conduct research.

IV. Personnel

This study is being conducted by Dr. Wayne K. Hoy, Fawcett Professor of Educational Administration at The Ohio State University. Jana Alig-Mielcarek, Jeffrey Geist, Mike Nicholson, and Jim Sinden will assist with data collection and analysis. Dr. Hoy and the other researchers working on this project can be reached at 614-292-4672. This study will involve the faculty members and principals of over 100 schools in Ohio.

V. Implications and Benefits

The problems schools face are difficult and complex. This is a large study with important implications as schools seek to adapt to changing sets of expectations in a diverse and rapidly changing world. This research concerns the quality of the social relationships in schools, and attempts to identify factors related to well-functioning schools. This study contributes to an understanding of the dynamics of school climate, structure, leadership, and efficacy in schools and the implications these have for student achievement. It is hoped that greater understanding of the human dynamics in schools will lead to better training of future administrators and the cultivation of greater productivity in schools.

APPENDIX B

SURVEY ADMINISTRATION DIRECTIONS

Directions for Administering Social Processes Surveys

Please distribute the questionnaires and pencils. Give ONE questionnaire to each teacher. There are three separate questionnaires, but each teacher should complete only one. Completing these questionnaires should only take about ten minutes. The principal will also be asked to complete a questionnaire while the teachers are completing theirs.

Please read the following statement to the faculty:

The surveys you are about to complete are part of a study of elementary schools in Ohio. This research concerns the quality of social relationships in schools and how they are related to each other. The study attempts to identify factors related to well functioning schools. It is hoped that greater understanding of the human dynamics in schools will lead to better training of teachers and administrators and the cultivation of greater productivity in schools.

This research is being conducted through the School of Education at The Ohio State University. All teachers' responses are anonymous. Data gathered about the school will be completely confidential. Data will be compiled at the school level and will be used for a statistical analysis of the relationships between the variables. We are not interested in ranking or rating individual schools.

Your participation is voluntary. You may decline to complete the survey or you may skip any item that you feel uncomfortable answering. Your refusal to participate will have no negative repercussion from the school. 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 are interested only in your frank opinion.

Several different forms of the questionnaire have been distributed, about a third of the faculty have received each form. Each teacher needs to complete only one form.

Your time, insights, and perceptions are valuable resources. Thank you for sharing them with us! If you have any questions, you may reach Dr. Wayne K. Hoy at The Ohio State University.

When the teachers have all the completed questionnaires, please return them to us.

Thank you for your participation. Please feel free to call us if you have any questions.

Jim Sinden, Mike Nicholson, and Jana Alig-Mielcarek (614-292-4672).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adler, P.S. (1994). Worker responses to new wave manufacturing. In John Storey (Ed.) *New Manufacturing Strategies*, 226-245. Paul Chapman: London.
- Adler, P.S. (1999). Building better bureaucracies. *The Academy of Management Executive*, 13, 36-49.
- Adler, P.S., & Borys B. (1996). Two types of bureaucracy: Enabling and coercive. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 61-89.
- Adler, P.S., Goldoftas, B., & Levine, D.I. (1998). Stability and change at NUMMI. In Robert Boyer, Elsie Charron, Ulrich Jurgens, & Steven Tolliday (Eds.) *Between imitation and innovation*, 28-160. Oxford University Press: New York.
- Adler, P.S. & Winogard, T.A. (1992). *Usability: Turning technologies into tools*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Aiken, M., & Hage, J. (1966). Organizational alienation: A comparative analysis. *American Sociological Review*, Aug., 497-507.
- Aiken, M., & Hage, J. (1968). Organizational interdependence and intra-organizational structure. *American Sociological Review*, 33, 912-930.
- Allison, S.T. & Messick, D.M. (1985). The group attribution error. *Journal of Social Experimental Psychology*, 21, 563-579.
- Alpern, K. D. (1997). What do we want trust to be? Some distinctions of trust. *Business & Professional Ethics Journal*, 16, 29-45.
- Ary, D., Jacobs, L.C., & Razavieh, A. (1996). *Introduction to research in education*. (5th ed.), Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Axelrod, R. (1984). *The evolution of cooperation*. New York: Basic Books.
- Axelrod, R. (1997). *The complexity of cooperation*. Princeton University Press.

- Axelrod, R., & Dion, D. (1988). The further evolution of cooperation. *Science*, 242, 1385-1390.
- Bacharach, M., & Gambetta, D. (2001). Trust in signs. In K.S. Cook (Ed.), *Trust in Society*. New York, N.Y.: Sage.
- Baier, A. (1986). Trust and antitrust. *Ethics*, 96, 231-260.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Barber, B. (1983). *The logic and limits of trust*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Beck, L., & Murphy, J. (1996). *The four imperatives of a successful school*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Bies, R.J., & Tripp, T.M. (1996). Beyond distrust: "Getting even" and the need for revenge. In R. Kramer & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Bixenstine, V.E., Potash, H. M., & Wilson, K. V. (1963). Effects of level of cooperative choice by the other player on choices in a prisoner's dilemma game: Part II. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67, 139-147.
- Blanchard, K. & Waghorn, T. (1997). *Mission possible*. New York, N.Y.: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Blau, P.M., & Scott, R.W. (1962). *Formal organizations: A comparative approach*. San Francisco, CA: Chandler Publishing Co.
- Blau, P.M., & Meyer, M.W. (1971). *Bureaucracy in Modern Society* (2nd edition). Random House.
- Bonjean, C.M., & Grimes, M. D. (1970). Bureaucracy and alienation: A dimensional approach. *Social Forces*, 48, 365-373.
- Bossert S., Dwyer, D., Rowan, B., & Lee, G. (1982). The instructional management role of the principal. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 18(3), 34-64.
- Brenkert, G. G. (1997). Marketing Trust: Barriers and bridges. *Business & Professional Ethics Journal*, 16, 77-98.
- Bryk, A.S., Lee, V.E., & Holland, P.B. (1993). *Catholic schools and the common good*. Harvard University Press.
- Butler, J.K. (1991). Toward understanding and measuring conditions of trust: Evolution of a conditions of trust inventory. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 643-663.

Butler, J.K. & Cantrell, R.S. (1984). A behavioral decision theory approach to modeling dyadic trust in superiors and subordinates. *Psychological Reports*, 55, 19-28.

California State Department of Education. (1980). *Report on the special studies of selected ECE schools with increasing and decreasing reading scores*. Sacramento, CA.: Office of Program Evaluation and Research, 1980.

Campbell, D.T. & Stanley, J.C. (1963). *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for research*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Campbell, J. B. (1977). On the nature of organizational effectiveness. In P. S. Goodman & J. M. Pennings (Eds.), *New perspectives on organizational effectiveness* (pp. 13-55). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chubb, J.E., & Moe, T. M. (1990). *Politics, markets, and America's schools*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Clark, M. C., & Payne, R.L. (1997). The nature and structure of workers' trust in management. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18, 205-224.

Coleman, J.S., Campbell, E., Hobson, C., McPartland, A., Mood, F., Weinfeld, F., & York, R. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity report*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Coleman, J.S., Hoffer, T., & Kilgore, S.B. (1982). *High school achievement: Public, catholic, and private schools compared*. New York: Basic Books.

Corwin, R. G. (1966). *Staff conflicts in the public schools*. (Cooperative Research Project No. 2637). The Ohio State University.

Cummings, L.L., & Bromily, P. (1996). The organizational trust inventory (OTI): Development and validation. In R. Kramer & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Cunningham, W.G., & Gresso, D.W. (1993). *Cultural leadership*. Boston MA: Allyn Bacon.

Darlington, R.B. (1990). *Regression and linear models*. McGraw-Hill.

Dasgupta, P. (1988). Trust as a Commodity. In D. Gambetta (Ed.), *Trust: Making and breaking cooperative relations*, 49-72. Cambridge, MA: Oxford University Press.

Deutsch, M. (1958). Trust and suspicion. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 2, 265-279.

Deutsch, M. (1960). The effect of motivational orientation upon trust and suspicion. *Human Relations*, 13, 123-39.

- Dibble, V. K. (1965). The organization of traditional authority: English county government, 1558 to 1640, in James G. March (Ed.), *Handbook of Organizations*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- DiPaola, M.F., & Hoy, W.K. (1994). Teacher militancy: A professional check on bureaucracy. *The Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 27, 78-82.
- Duke, D. L., Showers, B.K., & Imber, M. (1980). Teachers and shared decision making: The costs and benefits of involvement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 16, 93-106.
- Edmonds, R. (1979). Some schools work and more can. *Social Policy*, 9, 28-32.
- Elangovan, A. R., & Shapiro, D. L. (1998). Betrayal of trust in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 23, 547-566.
- Elmore, R. F. (1993). School Decentralization: Who gains? Who loses? In J. Hannaway & M. Carnoy (Eds.), *Decentralization and school improvement: Can we fulfill the promise?* 33-54. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Engel, G. V. (1969). The effect of bureaucracy on the professional autonomy of the physician. *Journal of health and social behavior*, 10, 30-41.
- Erikson, E.H., (1963). *Childhood and society* (2nd ed.), New York: Norton.
- Etzioni, A. (1961). *A comparative analysis of complex organizations*. New York: Free Press.
- Fehrmann, P.G., Keith, T. Z., & Reimers, T. M. (1987). Home influence on school learning: Direct and indirect effects of parental influence on high school grades. *Journal of Educational Research*, 80(6), 330-337.
- Firestone, W., & Wilson, B. (1985). Using bureaucratic and cultural linkages to improve instruction: The principal's contribution. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 20, 7-13.
- Flores, F. L., & Solomon, R. C. (1997). Rethinking trust. *Business & Professional Ethics Journal*, 16, 47-76.
- Frost, T., Stimpson, D.V., & Maughan, M.R. (1978). Some correlates of trust. *The Journal of Psychology*, 99, 103-108.
- Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust*. New York: MacMillan.
- Gabarro, J.J. (1978). The development of trust, influence, and expectations. In A.G. Athos & J.J. Gabarro (Eds.), *Interpersonal behavior: Communication and understanding in relationships*, 290-303. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Gabarro, J.J. (1987). *The dynamics of taking charge*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Galbraith, J.R. (1977). *Organizational design*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co.
- Gambetta, D. (1988). Can we trust trust? In D. Gambetta (Ed.), *Trust: Making and breaking cooperative relations*, 213-238. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell.
- Gibbons, G. (2001). Trust in social structures: Hobbes and Cose meet repeated games. In K.S. Cook (Ed.), *Trust in Society*, 332-353. New York, N.Y.: Sage.
- Ginsburg, A. L., & Hanson, S. L. (1986). *Values and educational success among disadvantaged students*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education and Decision Resources Corporation.
- Glaser, B. (1965). The local-cosmopolitan scientist. *American Journal of Sociology*, 69, 249-259.
- Goddard, R.D., Sweetland, S.R., & Hoy, W.K. (2000). Academic emphasis of elementary schools and student achievement in reading and mathematics. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36(5), 683-702.
- Goddard, R.D., Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W.K. (2001). A multilevel examination of the distribution and effects of teacher trust in students and parents in urban elementary schools. *The Elementary School Journal*, 102, 3-17.
- Golembiewski, R.T., & McConkie, M. (1975). The centrality of interpersonal trust in group processes. In C.L. Cooper (Ed.), *Theories of Group Processes*. New York: Wiley.
- Gouldner, A. (1950). *Studies in leadership*. New York: Harper & Bros.
- Gouldner, A.W. (1954). *Patterns of industrial bureaucracy*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Gouldner, A.W. (1957). Cosmopolitans and locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 281-292.
- Gorsuch, R.L. (1974). *Factor analysis*. Philadelphia, PA: W.B. Saunders Co.
- Govier, T. (1992). Distrust as a practical problem. *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 23(1), 52-63.
- Greeley, A. M. (1982). *Catholic high schools and minority students*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books.

- Hall, R. H. (1963). The concept of bureaucracy: An empirical assessment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 69, 32-40.
- Halpin, A.W., & Croft, D. B. (1963). *The organizational climate of schools*. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center of the University of Chicago.
- Hannaway, J. (1993). Decentralization in two school districts: Challenging the standard paradigm, in Hannaway, J. & Carnoy, M. (Eds.), *Decentralization and school improvement: Can we fulfill the promise?*, (pp. 135-162). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Hannaway, J. & Carnoy, M. (Eds.), (1993). *Decentralization and school improvement: Can we fulfill the promise?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Heck, R.H., Larsen, T.J., & Marcoulides, G.A. (1990). Instructional leadership and school achievement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 26(2), 94-125.
- Henderson, A.T., & Berla, N. (Eds.), (1997). *A new generation of evidence: The family is critical to student achievement*. Washington, DC: Center for Law and Education.
- Hoffman, J., Sabo, D., & Bliss, J., & Hoy, W.K. (1994). Building a culture of trust. *Journal of School Leadership*, 4, 484-501.
- Holmes, J. G., & Rempel, J. K. (1989). Trust in close relationships. In C. Hendrick (Ed.), *Close relationships* (pp. 187-220). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hosmer, L.T. (1995). Trust: The connecting link between organizational theory and philosophical ethics. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(2), 379-403.
- Hoy, W. K. (2001). The pupil control studies: A historical, theoretical, and empirical analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39(5), 424-441.
- Hoy, W. K., Blazovsky, R., & Newland, W. (1983). Bureaucracy and alienation: A comparative analysis. *The Journal of Educational Administration*, 21, 109-120.
- Hoy, W. K., & Clover, S. I. R. (1986). Elementary school climate: A revision of the OCDQ. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 22, 93-110.
- Hoy, W. K., & Feldman, J.A. (1987). Organizational health: The concept and its Measure. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 20, 30-38.
- Hoy, W. K., & Ferguson, J. (1985). A theoretical framework and exploration of organizational effectiveness in schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 21, 117-134.

- Hoy, W. K., Hannum, J., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (1998). Organizational climate and student achievement: A parsimonious view. *Journal of School Leadership*, 8, 336-359.
- Hoy, W. K., & Kupersmith, W. J. (1985). The meaning and measure of faculty trust. *Educational and Psychological Research*, 5, 1-10.
- Hoy, W. K., & Kupersmith, W. J. (1986). Principal authenticity and faculty trust: Key elements in organizational behavior. *Planning and Change*, 81-88.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1982). *Educational Administration: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd edition). New York: Random House.
- Hoy, W. K., & Miskel, C. G. (1996). *Educational Administration: Theory research, and practice* (5th edition). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Hoy, W.K., & Sabo, D.J. (1998). *Quality middle schools: Open and healthy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Hoy, W.K., Sabo, D.J., & Barnes, K. (1996). Organizational health and faculty trust: A view from the middle level. *Research in Middle Level Educational Quarterly*, Spring, 21-39.
- Hoy, W.K., Smith, P.A., & Sweetland, S.R. (2000). The development of the organizational climate index for high schools: Its measure and relationship to faculty trust. *Working Paper, The Ohio State University and University of Texas at San Antonio*.
- Hoy, W.K., & Sweetland, S.R. (2000). School bureaucracies that work: Enabling not coercive. *Journal of School Leadership*, 10, 525-541.
- Hoy, W.K., & Sweetland, S.R. (2001). Designing better schools: The meaning and measure of enabling school structures. *Educational Administrative Quarterly*, 37(3), 296-321.
- Hoy, W.K., & Tarter, C.J. (1997). *The Road to open and healthy schools: A handbook for change* (Elementary and secondary school edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Kottkamp, R. B. (1991). *Open schools/healthy schools: Measuring organizational climate*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Hoy, W.K., Tarter, C.J., Witkoskie, L. (1992). Faculty trust in colleagues: Linking the principal with school effectiveness. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 26(1), 38-45.

- Hoy, W.K. & Tschannen-Moran, M. (1999). Five faces of trust: An empirical confirmation in urban elementary schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, 9(3), 184-208.
- Huberman, M. (1993). The model of the independent artisan in teachers' professional relations. In J.W. Little & M. W. McLaughlin (Eds.), *Teachers' work: Individuals, colleagues, and contexts*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Hughes, L.W. (1974). Achieving effective human relations and morale. In J.A. Culbertson, C. Henson, & R. Morrison (Eds.), *Performance objectives for principals: concepts and instruments*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Isherwood, G.B., & Hoy, W.K. (1972). Bureaucratic structure reconsidered. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 41,(1).
- Jackson, S.E. & Schuler, R.S. (1985). A meta-analysis and conceptual critique of research on role ambiguity and role conflict in work settings. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 36(1), 16-78.
- Jennings, E.E. (1971). *Routes to the executive suite*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Johnson-George, C.E. & Swap, W.C. (1982). Measurement of specific interpersonal trust: Construction and validation of a scale to assess trust in a specific other. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43, 1306-1317.
- Jones, G.R. & George, J. M. (1998). The experience of evolution of trust: Implications for cooperation and teamwork. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 531-546.
- Kakabadse, A. (1986). Organizational alienation and job climate. *Small group behavior*, 17, 458-471.
- Katzell, R.A. & Yankelovich, D. (1975). *Work, productivity, and job satisfaction*. New York: New York University.
- Kerr, S. & Jermier, J. (1978). Substitutes for leadership: Their meaning and measurement. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 22, 375-403.
- Kipnis, D. (1996). Trust and technology. In R. Kramer & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Koehn, D. (1997). Trust and business: Barriers and bridges. *Business and Professional Ethics Journal*, 16, 7-28.
- Kormorita, S.S., (1965). Cooperative choice in a prisoner's dilemma game. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2, 741-745.

Kornhauser, W. (1962). *Scientists in industry: Conflict and accommodation*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kramer, R. M. (1996). Divergent realities and convergent disappointments in the hierarchic relation: Trust and the intuitive auditor at work. In R. Kramer, & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Kruse, S.D., Louis, K.S., & Bryk, A. S. (1995). An emerging framework for analyzing school-based professional community. In K. S. Louis & S. D. Kruse (Eds.), *Professionalism and community: Perspectives on reforming urban schools* (pp. 23-44). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.

Kuhlman, E. L., & Hoy, W. K. (1974). The socialization of professionals into bureaucracies: The beginning teacher in the school. *The Journal of Educational Administration*, 12, 18-27.

Larbaree, D. F. (1992). Power, knowledge, and the rationalization of teaching: A genealogy of the movement to professionalize teaching. *Harvard Educational Review*, 62(2), 123-154.

Lawler, E.E. (1992). *The ultimate advantage: Creating the high-involvement organization*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lawler, E.E. & Porter, L.W. (1964). The effects of "tall" vs. "flat" organization structures on managerial job satisfaction. In Michael M. Gruneberg (Ed.), *Job Satisfaction*. John Wiley & Sons: New York.

Lee, V. E., Bryk, A. S., & Smith, J. B. (1993). The organization of effective secondary schools. In L. Darling-Hammond (Ed.) *Review of Research in Education: Vol. 19* (pp. 171-267). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Levine, D.I. (1995). *Reinventing the workplace: How business and employees can both win*. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

Lewicki, R.J. & Bunker, B.B. (1996). Developing and maintaining trust in work relationships. In R. Kramer & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Lewicki, R.J., McAllister, D.J., & Bies, R.J. (1998). Trust and distrust: New relationships and realities. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 438-458.

Lewicki, R.J., & Stevenson, M.A. (1997). Trust development in negotiations: Proposed actions and a research agenda. *Business & Professional Ethics Journal*, 16, 99-132.

Lewis, J.D. & Weigert, A. J. (1985). Trust as a social reality. *Social Forces*, 63(4), 967-985.

Lindskold, S. (1978). Trust development, the GRIT proposal, and the effects of conciliatory acts on conflict and cooperation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 85, 772-793.

- Lindsfold, S., & Bennett, R. (1973). Attributing trust and conciliatory intent from coercive power capability. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 28(2), 180-186.
- Little, J.W. (1990). Conditions of professional development in secondary schools. In M.W. McLaughlin, J. E. Talbert, & N. Bascia (Eds.), *The contexts of teaching in secondary schools: Teachers' realities*. (pp. 187-223). New York: Teachers College. Press,.
- Little, J.W., & McLaughlin, M. W. (Eds.). (1993). *Teachers work: Individuals, colleagues, and contexts*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Loomis, J.L. (1959). Communication, the development of trust, and cooperative behavior *Human Relations*, 52, 305-315.
- Louis, K. S., & Kruse, S. D. (1995). *Professionalism and community: Perspectives on reforming urban schools*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Louis, K.S., & Miles, M.B. (1990). *Improving the urban high school: What works and why*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Luce, R.D., & Raiffa, H. (1957). *Games and decisions: Introduction and critical survey*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Luhmann, N. (1979). *Trust and Power*. Wiley.
- Luhmann, N. (1988). Familiarity, confidence, trust: Problems and alternatives. In D. Gambetta (Ed.), *Trust: Making and breaking cooperative relations*, (pp. 94-107). Cambridge, MA: Oxford University Press.
- Matthews, C. (1988). *Hardball: How politics is played--told by one who knows the game*. New York: Summit.
- Mayer, R.C., Davis, J.H., & Schoorman, D.F. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20, 709-734.
- McAllister, D.J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(1), 24-59.
- McGregor, D. (1967). *The professional manager*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- McLaughlin, M. W., Talbert, J.E., & Bascia, N. (Eds.). (1990). *The contexts of teaching in secondary schools: Teachers' realities*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Miller, G. (2001). Why is trust necessary in organizations? The moral hazard of profit maximization. In K.S. Cook (Ed.), *Trust in Society*. New York, N.Y.: Sage.

- Miller, G.A. (1967). Professionals in bureaucracy: Alienation among industrial scientists and engineers. *American Sociological Review*, Oct., 755-767.
- Mishra, A.K. (1996). Organizational responses to crisis: The centrality of trust. In R. Kramer & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Moorman, C., Zaltman, G., & Deshpande, R. (1992). Relationships between providers and users of market research: The dynamics of trust within and between organizations. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 29, 314-328.
- Murphy, J., Beck, L.G., Crawford, M., Hodges, A., & McGaughy, C.L. (2001). *The productive high school*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin Press, Inc.
- Murphy, J.F., Weil, M., Hallinger, P., & Mitman, A. (1982). Academic press. *Educational Leadership*, December, 22-26.
- Nanus, B. (1989). *The leader's edge: The seven keys to leadership in a turbulent world*. Chicago, IL: Contemporary Books.
- Newmann, F.M. (1997). How secondary schools contribute to academic success. In K. Borman & B. Schneider (Eds.), *Youth experiences and development: Social influences and educational challenges*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Organ, D.W. & Greene, C.N. (1981). The effects of formalization on professional involvement: A compensatory process approach. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26(2), 237-252.
- Osgood, C.E. (1959). Suggestions for winning the real war with communism. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 3, 295-325.
- Ouchi, W. (1981). *Theory Z*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Parsons, T. (1960). *Structure and process in modern societies*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Parsons, T. (1970). On building social system theory: A personal history. *Daedalus*, 99, 826-881.
- Pedhazur, E.J., & Schmelkin, L. (1991). *Measurement, design, and analysis: An integrated approach*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Pilisuk, M. & Skolnick, P. (1968). Inducing trust: A test of the Osgood proposal. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 8, 121-133.
- Pitner, N. (1988). The study of administrator effects and effectiveness. In N. Boyan (Ed.), *The handbook of research in educational research*. White Plains, NY; Longman.

- Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Moorman, R.H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1(2), 107-142.
- Podsakoff, P.M., Williams, L.J., & Todor, W.D. (1986). Effects of organizational formalization on alienation among professionals and nonprofessionals. *Academy of Management Journal*, 29(4), 820-831.
- Presthus, R. V. (1978). *The organizational society* (Revised edition). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Pugh, D., & Hickson, D. (1976). *Organizational structure in its context: The Aston programme I*. Saxon House.
- Pugh, D., Hickson, D., Hinings, C., MacDonald, K., Turner, C., Lupton, T. (1963). A conceptual scheme for organizational analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 8, 289-315.
- Pugh, D., Hickson, D., Hinings, C., and Turner, C. (1968). Dimensions of organization structure. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 13, 65-105.
- Punch, K. F. (1969). Bureaucratic structure in schools: Towards redefinition and measurement. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 5, 43-57.
- Purkey, S. C., & Smith, M. S. (1983). Effective schools: A review. *The Elementary School Journal*, 83(4), 427-452.
- Putnam, R.T., & Borko, H. (1997). Teacher learning: Implications of new views of cognition. In B.J. Biddle, T.L. Good, & I. F. Goodson (Eds.), *The International Handbook of Teachers and Teaching*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Pylyshyn, Z., Agnew, N., & Illingworth, J. (1966). Comparisons of individuals and pairs as participants in a mixed-motive game. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 10, 211-220.
- Rapoport, A., & Chammah, A. M. (1965). *Prisoner's dilemma*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Rempel, J.K., Holmes, J.G., & Zanna, M.D. (1985). Trust in close relationship. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 49, 95-112.
- Reissman, L. (1947). A study of role conceptions in bureaucracy. *Social Forces*, 27, 305-310.
- Rizzo, J., House, R., & Lirtzman, S. (1970). Role conflict and ambiguity in complex organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 23, 150-163.

Robinson, S.L. (1996). Trust and breach of the psychological contract. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 41, 574-599.

Roueche, J.E., & Baker, G.A., III, with Mullin, P.L., & Boy, N.H.O. (1986). *Profiling excellence in America's schools*. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.

Rosen, B. & Jerdee, T.H. (1977). Influence of subordinate characteristics on trust and use of participative decision strategies in a management simulation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62, 628-631.

Rotter, J.B. (1967). A new scale for the measurement of interpersonal trust. *Journal of Personality*, 35, 651-665.

Rotter, J. B. (1971). Generalized expectancies of interpersonal trust. *American Psychologist*, 26, 443-452.

Rotter, J.B. (1980). Interpersonal trust, trustworthiness, and gullibility. *American Psychologist*, 35, 1-7.

Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., Ouston, J., & Smith, A. (1979). *Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Schonberger, R.J. (1986). *World class manufacturing*. New York, N.Y: The Free Press.

Schlenker, B. R., Helm, B., & Tedeschi, J. T. (1973). The effects of personality and situational variables on behavioral trust. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 25, 419-427.

Schuler, R. S., Aldag, R. J., & Brief, A.P. (1977) Role conflict and ambiguity: A scale analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 20, 111-128.

Scott, W.R. (1998). *Organizations: Rational, natural, and open systems* (4th edition). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Seeman, M. (1971). The urban alienations: some dubious theses from Marx to Marcuse. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* (19), 135-143.

Senatra, P.T. (1980). Role conflict, role ambiguity, and organizational climate in a public accounting firm. *Accounting Review*, 55(4), 594-603.

Sergiovanni, T.J. & Starratt, R.J. (1993). *Supervision, a redefinition* (5th edition). New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Shapiro, D., Sheppard, B.H., & Cheraskin, L. (1992). Business on a handshake. *Negotiation Journal*, 8(4), 365-377.

Shure, G.H., Meeker, R.J., & Hansford, E.A. (1965). The effectiveness of pacifist strategies in bargaining games. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 9, 106-117.

Smith, P. A, Hoy, W. K., & Sweetland, S. R. (2001). Organizational health of high schools and dimensions of faculty trust. *Journal of School Leadership*, 11, 135-150.

Smith, T. S., & Ross, R. D. (1978). Cultural controls on the demography of hierarchy: A time-series analysis of warfare and the growth of the united states army, 1960-1968. *Unpublished paper, University of Rochester*.

Solomon, L. (1960). The influence of some types of power relations upon the level of interpersonal trust. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 61, 223-230.

Solomon, R.C., & Flores, F. (2001). *Building trust in business, politics, relationships, and life*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Snizek, W.E. & Bullard, J.H. (1983). Perception of bureaucracy and changing job satisfaction: A longitudinal analysis. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 32(2), 275-287.

State of New York, Office of Education Performance Review (1974). *School factors influencing reading achievement: A case study of two inner city schools*.

Steers, R. M. (1977). *Organizational effectiveness: A behavioral view*. Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear.

Strickland, L.H. (1958). Surveillance and trust. *Journal of Personality*, 26, 200-215.

Sweetland, S.R. & Hoy, W.K. (2000). School characteristics and educational outcomes. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 36(5), 703-729.

Sweetland, S.R. & Hoy, W.K. (2001). Varnishing the truth in schools: Principals and teachers spinning reality. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39, 282-293.

Sykes, G. (1999). The "new professionalism" in education: An appraisal. In J. Murphy & K.S. Seashore (Eds.), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (2nd edition). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 227-249.

Talbert, J. E. (1995). Boundaries of teachers' professional communities in U.S. high schools: Power and precariousness of the subject department. In L. S. Siskin & J. W. Little (Eds.), *The subjects in question: Departmental organization and the high school* (pp. 68-94). New York: Teachers College Press.

- Tarter, C.J., Bliss, J.R., & Hoy, W.K. (1989). School characteristics and faculty trust in secondary schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 25(3) 294-308.
- Tarter, C.J., Sabo, D., & Hoy, W.K. (1995). Middle school climate, faculty trust, and effectiveness: A path analysis. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*, 29, 41-49.
- Thompson, V.A. (1965). Bureaucracy and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 10, 1-20.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W.K. (1998). Trust in schools: A conceptual and empirical analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 36, 334-352.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W.K. (2000). *A multidisciplinary analysis of the nature, meaning, and measurement of trust*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Tyler, T.R., & DeGoey, P. (1996). Trust in organizational authorities: The influence of motive attributions on willingness to accept decisions. In R. Kramer & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in Organizations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Udy, S.H. (1959). Bureaucracy and rationality in Weber's organization theory. *American Sociological Review*, 24, 791-795.
- Uline, C.L., Miller, D.M., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (1998). School effectiveness: The underlying dimension. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 34(4), 462-483.
- Weber, G. (1971). *Inner-city children can be taught to read: Four successful schools*. Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education.
- Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organizations*. In T. Parsons (Ed.), A.M. Henderson and T. Parsons (Trans.). New York: Free Press.
- Wehlage, G.G., Rutter, R.A., Smith, G.A., Lesko, N., & Fernandez, R.R. (1989). *Reducing the risk: Schools as communities of support*. New York: Falmer.
- Wilensky, H.L. (1964). The professionalization of everyone? *The American Journal of Sociology*, (Sept.), 137-158.
- Williamson, (1975). *Markets and hierarchies*. New York: Free Press.
- Wolfe, D. M. & Snoek, J. D. (1962). A study of tensions and adjustment under role conflict. *Journal of Social Issues*, 102-121.
- Wrightsmann, L.S. (1966). Personality and attitudinal correlates of trusting and trustworthy behavior in a two-person game. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 4, 328-332.

Wrightsman, L.S. (1991). Interpersonal trust and attitudes toward human nature. In J. Robinson, P. Shaver, & L. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes: Vol. 1: measures of psychological attitudes*, 373-412. San Deigo: Academic Press.

Yamagishi, T. (2001). Trust as a form of social intelligence. In K.S. Cook (Ed.), *Trust in Society*, 121-147. New York, N.Y.: Sage.

Zand, D. E. (1972). Trust and managerial problem solving. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17, 229-239.

Zand, D. E. (1997). *The leadership triad: Knowledge, trust, and power*. New York: Oxford University Press.