

St. John Fisher College

Fisher Digital Publications

Education Doctoral

Ralph C. Wilson, Jr. School of Education

8-2017

Whom Do I Trust? Measuring Principals' Trust in Major Stakeholders Correlated to Leadership Behaviors in High Poverty Middle Schools

Liza Ortiz

St. John Fisher College, ms.lizaortiz@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: https://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/education_etd



Part of the Education Commons

[How has open access to Fisher Digital Publications benefited you?](#)

Recommended Citation

Ortiz, Liza, "Whom Do I Trust? Measuring Principals' Trust in Major Stakeholders Correlated to Leadership Behaviors in High Poverty Middle Schools" (2017). *Education Doctoral*. Paper 299.

Please note that the Recommended Citation provides general citation information and may not be appropriate for your discipline. To receive help in creating a citation based on your discipline, please visit <http://libguides.sjfc.edu/citations>.

This document is posted at https://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/education_etd/299 and is brought to you for free and open access by Fisher Digital Publications at St. John Fisher College. For more information, please contact fisherpub@sjfc.edu.

Whom Do I Trust? Measuring Principals' Trust in Major Stakeholders Correlated to Leadership Behaviors in High Poverty Middle Schools

Abstract

A growing body of research has examined relational trust in schools and its impact on school climate and student achievement. Trust is a complex concept. It has many layers such as benevolence, openness, reliability, competence, and honesty (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999). Principals who display collegial and supportive behaviors generate a high level of trust whereas principals who display restrictive and directive behaviors generate low levels of trust (Goddard, Tschannen-Moran, & Hoy, 2001). Principals are vital stakeholders in a school community. This is especially true for principals who serve high poverty schools where the challenges are unique and daunting. Despite the research on the importance of relational trust as a social capital tool for schools, there is little research that includes the principals' perception of trust in their stakeholders. This descriptive quantitative study explored the relationship between the principals' level of trust with his/her major stakeholders and the principals' level of engagement in key leadership behaviors. High poverty middle school principals from a northeastern area were surveyed. The survey instrument includes statements on trust, organizational climate, leadership behaviors. The results of this study revealed that principals trust their major stakeholders and practice effective leadership behaviors are trustworthy leaders. This study filled a void in research on relational trust in schools.

Document Type

Dissertation

Degree Name

Doctor of Education (EdD)

Department

Executive Leadership

First Supervisor

Robert Siebert

Subject Categories

Education

Whom Do I Trust? Measuring Principals' Trust in Major Stakeholders Correlated to
Leadership Behaviors in High Poverty Middle Schools

Liza Ortiz

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree
E.D. in Executive Leadership

Supervised by

Dr. Robert Siebert

Committee Member

Dr. Sandye Johnson

Ralph C. Wilson, Jr. School of Education
St. John Fisher College

August 2017

Copyright by
Liza Ortiz
2017

Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to several people. I could not have completed this endeavor without my supportive community. This dissertation is dedicated:

To my awesome God, who has always provided a way when I thought there wasn't a way. Because of HIM, I am...

To the two men in my life that I adore tremendously- my husband and son. Both patiently supported me emotionally and physically. Both of you are my rock. To my husband, I love you. To my son, my hopes and dreams are for your happiness and success. Thank you both for pushing and inspiring me to reach for the sky.

To my mother, my fathers, and my brother. Your blessings and prayers allowed for this journey to come to fruition. Thank you for your love.

To my friends, my cohort members, and my colleagues. Thank you for being my cheerleaders.

To my committee chair, committee member, and advisor. Words cannot express how much I appreciate your persistence and belief in me. You made me a believer of the phrase, "Trust the process." Thank you for your guidance.

To principals who work endless hours, who extend trust regardless of betrayal or loyalty, and who are supportive, collegial, competent, honest, reliable, benevolent, and open. Thank you for being an inspiration to all.

Biographical Sketch

Ms. Liza Ortiz is currently a principal in an urban middle school. Ms. Ortiz has worked in public education for 20 years. She attended the State University of New York at Albany and graduated with a Bachelor of Arts degree and a Master's of Science degree in Education. She attended Massachusetts College of Liberal Arts and earned an Advancement Certificate of Study in Educational Administration. She entered St. John Fisher College and began her doctoral studies in the Ed.D. Program in Executive Leadership. Ms. Ortiz, pursued her research on principals' relational trust with major stakeholders and their leadership behaviors, under the scholarly leadership of Dr. Siebert and received her Ed.D in 2017.

Abstract

A growing body of research has examined relational trust in schools and its impact on school climate and student achievement. Trust is a complex concept. It has many layers such as benevolence, openness, reliability, competence, and honesty (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999). Principals who display collegial and supportive behaviors generate a high level of trust whereas principals who display restrictive and directive behaviors generate low levels of trust (Goddard, Tschannen-Moran, & Hoy, 2001).

Principals are vital stakeholders in a school community. This is especially true for principals who serve high poverty schools where the challenges are unique and daunting. Despite the research on the importance of relational trust as a social capital tool for schools, there is little research that includes the principals' perception of trust in their stakeholders.

This descriptive quantitative study explored the relationship between the principals' level of trust with his/her major stakeholders and the principals' level of engagement in key leadership behaviors. High poverty middle school principals from a northeastern area were surveyed. The survey instrument includes statements on trust, organizational climate, leadership behaviors. The results of this study revealed that principals trust their major stakeholders and practice effective leadership behaviors are trustworthy leaders. This study filled a void in research on relational trust in schools.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| Dedication | iii |
| Biographical Sketch | iv |
| Abstract | v |
| Table of Contents | vi |
| List of Tables | ix |
| Chapter 1: Introduction | 1 |
| Problem Statement | 7 |
| Statement of Purpose | 8 |
| Significance of the Study | 8 |
| Theoretical Rationale | 9 |
| Research Questions | 11 |
| Definitions of Terms | 12 |
| Chapter Summary | 15 |
| Chapter 2: Review of the Literature..... | 17 |
| Introduction and Purpose | 17 |
| Trust in Organizations and in Schools | 17 |
| Importance of Trust in High Poverty Schools | 33 |
| National Reform Movement and the Impact on Trust in High Poverty Schools..... | 39 |
| Chapter Summary | 43 |
| Chapter 3: Research Design Methodology | 45 |

| | |
|---|-----|
| Introduction..... | 45 |
| Research Context | 47 |
| Research Participants | 48 |
| Instruments Used in Data Collection | 48 |
| Procedures for Data Collection and Analysis | 51 |
| Chapter Summary | 54 |
| Chapter 4: Data Analysis | 56 |
| Introduction..... | 56 |
| Research Questions..... | 57 |
| Data Analysis and Findings | 58 |
| Summary of Results | 68 |
| Chapter 5: Discussion | 70 |
| Introduction..... | 70 |
| Implication of Findings..... | 73 |
| Limitations | 82 |
| Recommendations for Future Research | 83 |
| Conclusion | 84 |
| References..... | 87 |
| Appendix A..... | 95 |
| Appendix B..... | 105 |
| Appendix C | 107 |
| Appendix D..... | 108 |
| Appendix E | 110 |

| | |
|-----------------|-----|
| Appendix F..... | 111 |
| Appendix G..... | 123 |
| Appendix H..... | 125 |

List of Tables

| Item | Title | Page |
|-------------|--|-------------|
| Table 4.1 | Sample Demographics | 60 |
| Table 4.2 | Descriptive Statistics for Principals' Trust in Stakeholders | 62 |
| Table 4.3 | Correlations Among Principals' Level of Trust of Stakeholder Groups | 63 |
| Table 4.4 | Descriptive Statistics for Principals' Self-Reported Leadership Behaviors | 64 |
| Table 4.5 | Principals' Correlational Leadership Behaviors | 65 |
| Table 4.6 | Five Faces of Trust as Applied to the Measures of Principals Trust in Stakeholders | 66 |
| Table 4.7 | Principals Trust in Stakeholders Correlated to the Concepts of the Five Faces of Trust | 66 |
| Table 4.8 | Five Faces of Trust as Applied to the Measures of Principal Leadership Behaviors | 67 |
| Table 4.9 | Principals' Leadership Behaviors Correlated to the Concepts of the Five Faces of Trust | 68 |

Chapter 1: Introduction

If people are the life blood of a school, then principals are its heart (Fullan, 2014; Santoyo, 2012). The relationships between and among the principal and his/her people will determine the success of a school (Peters & Waterman, 1982). Of course, every relationship is different but they all matter as they are the conduits for effective leadership and practice in any culture. From a vast pool of research, we can conclude that positive relationships strengthen the organization's culture as they make the workplace enjoyable and productive (Covey, 2006; Covey & Link, 2012; Keating, 2012; Mind Tools, 2016; Peter & Waterman, 1982; Tschannen-Moran, 2014).

However, positive relationships do not form without trust. All successful relationships rely on trust as it determines the level of engagement of all constituents. Effective organizations understand the cost of distrust because organizations with high trust have consistently outperformed organizations with low trust (Kouzes & Posner, 2012). Every conversation held and every action taken is cautioned for distrust until proven trustworthy (Lawrence & Lynch, 2011). Once trust is established it creates positive resources that bring about organizational value. In terms of the "bottom line," trust impacts the organization's dividends (Covey, 2006).

Trust is both simple and complex. The simplicity of trust is knowing when one has it and when one does not have it. The complexity of trust is when, "we get it wrong by, giving it either too readily or too stingily" (Keating, 2012, para. 1). Often, stakeholders are not sure what trust means or what to reasonably expect from a

relationship of trust. One then might question, “What is the definition of trust?” Robert Porter Lynch states,

At a minimal level, trust is the absence of fear in a relationship: it is knowing that you won’t intentionally hurt me. But at a higher level, its reliance- knowing that: you will be there for me when I need you; you won’t sacrifice me for your self-interest; you can be counted on to work for my best interest as well as yours; and ultimately I will be better off from having trusted you. (2008, p. 1)

Trust is built with open communication, mutual respect, and developed over time (DuFour & Mattos, 2013). “Trust is restorative and can be effectively taught and learned” (Covey, 2008, p. 303). It is the pulse of an organization because it impacts all stakeholders and the longevity of the organization (Covey, 2006).

Relationships based on trust have garnered so much attention because high levels of trust impact professionalism, and promote positive interactions and performance in organizations (Adams, 2010; Milner, 2013; Tschannen-Moran, 2014). But, trust is a vague, complex, and emotional concept that cannot simply be defined (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999). Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) wrote *Five Faces of Trust: An Empirical Confirmation in Urban Elementary Schools*, which explored the multifaceted conditions and behaviors that build trust. They defined it as “one’s willingness to risk being vulnerable” (p. 187) as demonstrated in the behaviors one exhibits to another. Those behaviors or five faces are benevolence, honesty, openness, reliability, and competence. These behaviors repeated by a leader overtime can positively impact the level of trust in an organization.

In school cultures, trust cannot be under estimated or undervalued (Covey, 2006). There is nothing more important than building trust in a school (Tschannen-Moran, 2014). School relationships that are built on trust contribute to the school's success (Tschannen-Moran, 2011). It is a powerful tool used to develop relationships. When relationships are not built on trust, "cynicism, doubt, and anxiety lead to 'time off-task' speculation, low energy, and productivity. When people lack trust in their leaders, they do not come toward something; they pull back and withdraw instead. They doubt rather than cooperate" (Blanchard, 2017, p. 1). It is clear from the research that relationships with strong foundations of trust are the essential work of the leader (Covey, 2006, 2009). Effective school leaders develop and maintain trust because it is necessary if teachers are to adhere to and support the principals' efforts. Extending trust first is a risk a principal must take in order to begin to establish productive relationships. Fostering, nurturing, cultivating, maintaining, and restoring trust with their stakeholders is not an easy task but it is the essential leadership practice (Daly, 2009; Kouzes & Posner, 2012).

It can be argued that the principal is the most important stakeholder in the school building when it comes to building a culture of trust. If the interactions with the principal are credible, honest, open, and collaborative then the principal will be perceived as trustworthy and trust will be easily fostered (Tschannen-Moran, 2001). Principals work with, for, and through teachers as they lead schools in order to accomplish shared educational objectives (Tschannen-Moran, 2014). Trust in leadership (Bryk & Schneider, 1996; Goddard, Salloum, & Berebitsky, 2009) is a strong predictor of academic achievement.

The principal's leadership is "inextricably linked to student achievement" (The Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement, 2017, p. 1). His or her leadership is the "linchpin of success" (Parrett & Budge, 2012, p. 3). Leithwood, Seashore, Anderson, and Wahlstrom (2004) assert,

Leadership is second only to classroom instruction among all school-related factors that contribute to what students learn at school. Leadership effects are usually largest where and when they are needed most. Without a powerful leader, troubled schools are unlikely to be turned around. (p. 7)

The principal matters. Great schools do not exist apart from great leaders (Seashore-Louis, Dretzke, & Wahlstrom, 2010).

Being a principal is hard work (Seashore-Louis et al., 2010). The work is even harder when the principal serves a low performing, high poverty, and high minority school community (Seashore-Louis et al., 2010). Fortunately, recent studies suggest that stability in the principals' leadership is a crucial ingredient in improving high poverty school's achievement, but principals cannot do it alone. (Seashore-Louis et al., 2010). Principals and teachers of high poverty schools must work in trusting relationships to confront the challenges that affect their students' success (Adams, 2010; Seashore-Louis et al., 2010; Tschannen-Moran, 2014).

The research demonstrates clearly that distrust is heightened from all stakeholders when a school has a negative school identification among the state for not consistently meeting the proficiency levels (Milner, 2013; Noguera, 2003; Tschannen-Moran, 2001). Taken together, this distrust impacts the principals' ability to attain the school's improvement goals (Covey, 2006; Tschannen-Moran, 2011). Therefore, developing and

maintaining trust, particularly in high poverty schools, is more crucial and more difficult for principals if they are to improve student performance (Murnane, 2007; Noguera, 2003; Seashore-Louis et al., 2010; Tschannen-Moran, 2001).

Building relationships and trust in high poverty urban public schools is made more difficult due to usual characteristics of high poverty schools. These high poverty schools are often characterized by having new and unqualified teachers, low teacher retention rates, lack of parent involvement, lack of educational resources, inconsistent leadership, poor school conditions, and overcrowded classes (Center for Public Education, [CPE] 2005; Noguera, 2003). These conditions can lead stakeholders to mistrust. It also can lead to frustration, doubt, low productivity, low performance on high stakes assessments, and turnover. Taken together, this distrust impacts the principals' ability to attain the school's improvement goals (Covey, 2006; Tschannen-Moran; 2011).

Naturally, stakeholders such as students, parents, and teachers want/need to believe that they are valued and welcomed to make decisions that impact the school's success. Students and their parents need to be certain that the leadership and school staff are stable. They need to be confident that staff will work with and support families (Adams, Forsyth, & Mitchell, 2009; Noguera, 2003).

In a trusting school, the principal and teachers make up the support system for a student. This can bolster and compensate what is often a weak support system found in the student's home (Adams, 2010). As principals continue to share this responsibility of educating and supporting students and preparing them for their future educational endeavors, trust will remain the high leverage factor in this relationship (Santoyo, 2012).

School improvement efforts such as the one required of principals in the No Child Left Behind Act, or the Race to the Top have made it difficult for principals to cultivate trust that can positively impact student's achievement (Bryk, Sebring, Allensworth, Easton, & Luppescu, 2010; Daly, 2009; Goddard, 2003; Goddard et al., 2001; Hoy, Smith, & Sweetland, 2003; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Tschannen-Moran 2009, 2014). Meeting the demands of the accountability measures with insufficient resources has much to do with the high dissatisfaction levels among principals, especially in the high poverty schools (Blankstein & Noguera, 2015). These accountability reform measures assume the principals will make instructional decisions, teachers will collaborate, parents will understand what their child is expected to learn, and students will learn more than what they learned from the last reform (Bryk et al., 2010; Singh & Al-Fadhi, 2011). What reform accountability measures fail to realize, however, is that trusting relationships need to be established in order for school improvement to occur in high poverty schools (Bryk et al., 2010). Unfortunately, on demand testing accountability structures have made the difficult job of building trusting relationships even more problematic (Bryk et al., 2010; Mackiewicz, 2011).

It is clear from the research that trust in schools, particularly in high poverty schools, is an essential driver of student success (Adams, 2010; Seashore-Louis et al., 2010; Tschannen-Moran, 2014). Decreased student achievement in high poverty schools has sparked a closer examination of trust and the relationships found in school communities, and the level of trust the school stakeholders have in their principal (Bryk, et al., 2010; Fullan, 2014; Romero, 2015; Tschannen-Moran, 2014). In this study, there is much available data on the level of trust between stakeholders and in the principals of

this northeastern urban school district. However, missing in this body of research is the reciprocal flow of trust from the principal to his/her stakeholders.

Problem Statement

Principals are vital stakeholders in leveraging school improvement and relational trust. While there is a sense of urgency in improving achievement in high poverty schools, principals must first ensure that trust has been established. Of course, as the school leader, the principal must offer his/her trust first without pre-conditions. A school leader cannot expect stakeholders to give their trust, they must earn it through frequent interactions. To build this level of trust in the principal takes time (Bryk et al., 2010; Covey, 2006; Tschannen-Moran, 2014). In time, stakeholders will buy into and support the school's vision, and the work to attain the school's instructional goals (Santoyo, 2012).

Clearly, much time and attention has been paid to relational trust in schools, particularly the trust stakeholders have in their principal. Curiously absent from all this research is the reciprocal flow of trust the principal has in his/her stakeholders. The trust parents, teachers, and students have in one another and in their building leader are surveyed, interviewed, and studied endlessly. But, arguably, the single most important stakeholder in determining students' and school success and building effectiveness is never asked those same questions. We are forced to ask, "Whom does the principal trust?"

This study measured high poverty, urban middle school principals' levels of trust in their stakeholders. It correlated these measurements with the level of engagement in the *five faces of trust*, a model defined by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999). These trust

characteristics and behaviors of trust are benevolence, reliability, competence, honesty, and openness. This study sought to look at trust through the eyes of the principal and add to the research on relational trust and its impact on high poverty schools.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study is to fill a void in the research on relational trust in schools conducted by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran, (1999), Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000), Tschannen-Moran and Gareis (2004, 2015), and Bryk and Schneider (2002). These researchers examined the levels of trust of the major stakeholders and provided recommended leadership practices for central and school level administrators. But, they did not examine the level of trust the principal has in his/her stakeholders. This study explored principals' levels of trust in their teachers, parents, and students and principals' level of engagement using the model of the five faces of trust.

Numerous educational researchers have produced findings focused on the level of trust among teachers, parents, and students in the principal. However, it is equally important to further the research on relational trust to include the principals' trust in their stakeholders and how that trust may be different than the trust stakeholders have in their principal.

Significance of the Study

Bryk and Schneider (1996, 2002) focused on relational trust in the Chicago Public School System. Their research has been cited in the seminal work of Tschannen-Moran (2001, 2014) on relational trust and its impact on school improvement. Similarly, Goddard (2003), Adams (2010), and Hoy et al. (2003) examined trust in the relationship between and among parents, students, teachers, and their principal. They concluded that

trust in the principal matters to the school's stakeholders and trust in the principal affects school improvement. They made recommendations regarding the types of behaviors principals must display in order to gain trust from their stakeholders.

These researchers would all agree that the principal is a vital stakeholder in the school community. These same researchers have also expanded the principals' knowledge on how to build, cultivate, restore, and foster trust in their schools through their research on relational trust. But, they have not assessed the principals' trust in stakeholders and whether that trust is different than the trust the principal extends to his or her teachers, parents, and students. Most of the studies on relational trust have overlooked the principals' leadership behaviors and their correlation to the principals' level of trust in stakeholders. This study adds to the field of education and educational reform by understanding these unexamined relationships.

Theoretical Rationale

The theoretical rationale guiding this proposed study is the social capital theory. Social capital theory is the belief that relationships, or "networks," are formed for a specific purpose, profit, investment, or benefit (Tzanakis, 2013). Trust is closely aligned to the social capital theory. Entrepreneurial leadership strategies such as the use of social capital are needed for leaders to ensure their organization's success (Leitch, McMullan, & Harrison, 2013; Tzanakis, 2013).

Leadership and the use of social capital is one of the strategic approaches of the 21st century leader (Leitch et al., 2013). The role of the leader has changed from the 20th century to the 21st century. Leaders were the heroes of the organization. Accolades were given to the leader when the company was successful (Leitch et al., 2013). Leaders were

removed from the day to day social interactions in their organization. Social capital was not as necessary then. Now, leaders must recognize the need to invest in the interactions found in their organization. This 21st century premise is based not on what one man can do alone, it is the collective that improves the organization's outcomes (Leitch et al., 2013).

With the unique challenges of the 21st century, leaders are faced with a most competitive landscape. Leaders must be strategic if they are to embed external and internal approaches to social capital development (Hitt & Duane, 2002). The perspective of Hitt and Duane on internal social capital illuminates the approach leaders use to create teams to collectively perform and accomplish tasks, and build community within the organization (Hitt & Duane, 2002; Leitch et al., 2013). Whereas, the perspective of Hitt and Duane on external social capital elucidates the approach leaders use to develop beneficial relationships with outside organizations. This means that if leaders employed the external and internal approaches, their organizations would yield positive results (Hitt & Duane, 2002).

Trust as a social capital strategy is used by principals to develop a supportive environment that impacts student achievement. The levels of trust among stakeholders are viewed as a social capital network in schools. If trusting relationships increase then the school's social capital increases whereas if trusting relationships decrease then the school's social capital decreases (Putnam, 2000). Principals who display the behaviors of benevolence, honesty, openness, reliability, and competence as defined in the five faces of trust have a higher social capital than those who do not display the behaviors or the five faces of trust (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Putnam, 2000). Moreover, Lin

(1999) stated that developing relational trust, as a social capital strategy, is a worthwhile investment as it ensures increased student performance. The use of relational trust allows school communities to display shared expectations and shared values (Lin, 1999).

Social capital between families, students, teachers, and principals can have a positive or a negative impact on student outcomes (Shoji, Haskins, Rangel, & Sorensen, 2014). According to Shoji et al. (2014) the difference between trust as a social capital will vary among social class, ethnicity, and race. Similarly, Noguera (2003) argues that the use of social capital in low income communities will increase the understanding of the lack of equality, equity, and access in the educational system. Social capital can help families to feel comfortable culturally as they interact with their schools. The use of social capital results in higher parent engagement, trust, and high levels of positive student behaviors towards learning (Milner, 2013; Shoji et al., 2014).

Research Questions

This study does not assume that trust is given in the same manner by each stakeholder. This study assumed, like other research, that trust is essential for school improvement. This study sought to answer the following questions:

1. To what extent do principals of high poverty urban middle schools trust their parents, teachers, and students?

- 1a. Are the high poverty urban middle school principals' level of trust in parents, teachers, and students significantly correlated with one another?

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between the high poverty urban middle school principals' level of trust in their major stakeholders.

2. To what extent do the principals of high poverty urban middle schools report that they have used supportive, restrictive, collegial, and directive leadership behaviors?

2a. Are the high poverty urban middle school principals' reporting of the four types of leadership behavior significantly correlated with one another?

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between the high poverty urban middle school principals' leadership behaviors.

3. To what extent are the principals' endorsements of the five faces of trust correlated when applied to trust in stakeholders?

Null Hypothesis: Endorsements of the five faces of trust are not correlated when applied to trust in stakeholders.

4. To what extent are the principals' endorsements of the five faces of trust correlated when applied to self-reported leadership behaviors?

Null Hypothesis: Endorsements of the five faces of trust are not correlated when applied to self-reported leadership behaviors.

Definitions of Terms

No Child Left Behind Act – (No Child Left Behind [NCLB], 2002) of 2001 was enacted to respond to America's crisis of under-achievement by high poverty students in high poverty schools. The purpose of NCLB was to ensure that all children have a "fair, equal, and significant opportunity to obtain a high-quality education and reach, at a minimum, proficiency on challenging state academic achievement standards and state academic assessments" (U.S. Department of Education, 2016, para. 1). NCLB held individual states and local educational agencies (local schools and districts) accountable

for improving the academic achievement of all students, as well as identifying and turning around low performing schools that failed to provide a high quality education for their students (National Conference of State Legislatures, [NCSL], 2001).

Common Core State Standards (CCSS) – were initiated in 2009 by state leaders, governors and state educational commissioners in response to inconsistent learning standards each state developed that defined the proficiency level for students in Grades 3-5 and high school. The CCSS aims to develop consistent standards that address students’ expected understanding and set “real world learning goals” that would prepare students in Grades K-12 for college and career. At each grade level there are learning goals that each student needs to meet and be able to demonstrate (Common Core State Standards Initiative, [CCSSI], 2015).

Economically disadvantaged students – are those who participate in, or whose family participates in, economic assistance programs, such as the free or reduced-price lunch programs, Social Security Insurance (SSI), Food Stamps, Foster Care, Refugee Assistance (cash or medical assistance), Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC), Home Energy Assistance Program (HEAP), Safety Net Assistance (SNA), Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), or Family Assistance: Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). If one student in a family is identified as low income, all students from that household (economic unit) may be identified as low income (NYSED, 2016d; U.S. Department of Education, 2016).

Middle Schools – are commonly known as the educational settings after elementary school and before high school. Middle Schools may have Grades 5 through 8, Grades 6 through 8, or Grades 7 through 9 (Lucchese, 2009; Tilley 2011). For the

purposes of this study middle school is referred to as a school that educates sixth graders through eighth graders.

School in Good Standing – is a school that met their annual yearly progress targets as defined by the NYSED (NYSED, 2004).

Performance Level Rating – is a score that ranges from level 3 to level 4 on the New York State Assessments. The performance level of 3 to 4 means that the tested students are proficient in New York State P-12 Common Core Learning Standards for English Language Arts (ELA) and mathematics. A student achieving a level 3 or 4 “demonstrates knowledge, skills, and practices embodied that are considered sufficient for the expectations at this grade” (NYSED, 2016a, para. 3)

Low performing schools – are schools that have been designated by the New York State Education Department as schools that are not in “good standing.” These have not met their annual yearly progress for 2 of 3 consecutive years. The schools’ annual yearly progress is taken from the states’ performance index formula (Tilley, 2011).

Performance index – is a value from 0 to 200 that is assigned to an accountability group, indicating how that group performed on a required State test (or approved alternative) in English language arts, mathematics, or science. PIs are determined using the performance levels and equations. The equation is, “ $PI = [(number\ of\ continuously\ enrolled\ tested\ students\ scoring\ at\ Levels\ 2,\ 3,\ and\ 4 + the\ number\ scoring\ at\ Levels\ 3\ and\ 4) \div number\ of\ continuously\ enrolled\ tested\ students] \times 100$ ” (NYSED, 2016c, para 12).

Relational Trust – is the social capital that allows individuals to develop a relationship that affects student achievement or demonstrate profits (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Covey, 2006; Putnam, 2000).

High Poverty Middle Schools – have, for the purpose of this study, 85% or more of their student population eligible for Title I Federal Funds.

Title I – of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended (ESEA) provides financial assistance to local educational agencies (LEAs) and schools with high numbers or high percentages of children from low-income families to help ensure that all children meet challenging state academic standards. Federal funds are currently allocated through four statutory formulas that are based primarily on poverty estimates and the cost of education in each state (U.S. Department of Education, 2016).

Chapter Summary

Organizations are no longer built on force, but on trust (Drucker, 1985). Unfortunately, high poverty families have lost faith and trust in the schools as a result of their children's persistent low achievement on high stakes, state assessments (Adams, 2010; Jensen, 2009; Noguera, 2003; Tschannen-Moran, 2014). What is a principal to do who is held accountable to these test results which do not demonstrate the overall growth of a student? How can a principal demonstrate the impact of their leadership when there are many impediments and obstacles their high poverty students face in and out of school?

In spite of the political pressures and the loss of faith, principals of high poverty schools must make every effort to foster trust with their stakeholders. The presence of trust in schools can significantly increase high poverty students' performance (Adams,

2010; Milner, 2013; Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2015). Michael Fullan (2014) says that principals sway the school's culture. They can positively or negatively impact trust in a school (Covey, 2006; Louis, 2007; Tschannen-Moran, 2014). This cause and effect has been researched and studied extensively. But, curiously absent from the research is the principals' level of trust in his or her stakeholders. There is value in adding research on the principal's level of trust in his or her stakeholders and correlating that trust to the principal's level of engagement in the behaviors that foster trust namely, the five faces of trust: benevolence, openness, reliability, competence, and honesty (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999). This study sought to fill this void by providing a new and unique perspective on trust in schools. This may possibly lead to leadership development that focuses on building behaviors that strengthen the level of trust that a principal has with their stakeholders.

Chapter 2: Review of the Literature

Introduction and Purpose

More and more it has become evident that the bottom line in ensuring results, profits, and progress is the level of trusting relationships in an organization. Researchers identified trust as the essential element for grading the effectiveness of an organization (Covey & Link, 2012). “The best leaders recognize that trust impacts us 24/7, 365 days a year. It undergirds and affects the quality of every relationship, every communication, every project, every venture, every effort . . . and alters their trajectory and outcome” (Covey, 2009, p. 4).

According to Covey and Link (2012), in *Smart Trust: Creating Prosperity, Energy, and Joy in a Low-Trust World*, when the trust in an organization is high, the energy of the organization results in creative, generous, motivated, and authentic productivity. In other words, “trust enables everything to move faster, more effortlessly, and with less conflict” (Lawrence & Lynch, 2011, p.17). This review of literature begins with a consideration of the descriptors of trust in organizations. Next, this review covers the importance of trust in school cultures along with trust and its effect on and importance to stakeholders. Finally, this review emphasizes the importance of trust in high poverty schools.

Trust in Organizations and in Schools

Researchers have used many metaphors in an attempt to convey the importance of trust. According to Adams (2013) trust is the adhesive in an organization. Trust is the

lubricant that keeps the learning community united (Adams, 2013; Fukuyama, 1995). In schools, trust is an essential ingredient for school improvement (Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2004, 2015; Tschannen-Moran, 2001, 2009). This literature review began with descriptors of trust in organizations with an emphasis on trust in schools.

In an organization there are many reasons that trust can be lost. Lawrence and Lynch (2011) stated that without trust, alliances are fragile. In order for trust to improve, leaders must understand the causes of distrust. Fear causes distrust and causes people to defend their honor (Lawrence & Lynch, 2011). The fear of humiliation, belittlement, incompetence, being emotionally broken, or physically hurt causes distrust. If trust is lost, the victim may seek revenge on the one that broke the trust. A great deal of thinking and planning is required when one seeks revenge. The cost of revenge in schools is detrimental as it affects the organizations profits (Lawrence & Lynch, 2011; Tschannen-Moran, 2014). Based on *Trust Matters: Leadership for Successful Schools*, “When trust is given to the “trustor” there are expectations that are assumed allowing the “trustee” to feel vulnerable. If those expectations are not met, then the trustee may respond with the desire for revenge and resentment” (Tschannen-Moran, 2014, p. 97).

However, Lawrence and Lynch (2011) provided insight on how to improve trust. They believed that trust is needed for survival. They stated, “Trust’s greatest value can be achieved only in an organization where basic values are reinforced with concrete and measurable behavioral actions. Only then can organizations reach new heights in relationships” (Lawrence & Lynch, 2011, p. 18). Lawrence and Lynch (2011) described four driving innate elements that will achieve trust. They described how the brain is genetically wired to create trust and distrust in humans. The human tactics that influence

the brains' level of trustworthiness is the need to create, acquire, bond, and defend. They defined each as follows. Creating is the ability to learn, to comprehend, to inquire, and to invent. Acquiring is the ability to own, to compete for, and to secure. Bonding is the ability to form relationships and alliances, to work in teams, and to develop organizations. Lastly, defending is the ability to protect, have security and safety.

Kouzes and Posner (2012) described trust as the belief in a persons' integrity, character, and reciprocity of one's intention and behaviors. In a survey to 75,000 potential respondents, Kouzes and Posner identified the characteristics that strengthen the leaders' trust level with their stakeholders. The top five leadership characteristics that can impact the leaders' credibility were honesty, vision, competence, and inspiration. They believed that credibility is closely tied to trust (Kouzes & Posner, 2012).

Many educational researchers have studied the descriptors of trust in schools and its impact on student achievement. Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) developed a multifaceted definition of faculty trust from an empirical study in an urban elementary school. They discovered that trust has five facets. The five facets of trust were benevolence, reliability, competence, honesty, and openness. Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999) described trust as the element in a school that reduces ambiguity and increases respect of expectations and responsibilities. "Trust is an individual's or groups 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.187).

In Louis' (2007) three-year qualitative study of five high schools from different districts, she assessed the teachers' willingness to implement improved quality of

management and pedagogical practices for their schools and classrooms under the leadership of their school administrator. Louis (2007) described trust as a social construct. Trust is “confidence in or reliance on the integrity, veracity, justice, friendship, or other sound principle, of another person or group” (Louis, 2007, p. 2). She organized trust into two categories, organizational trust and relational trust and its impact on the organization. Louis defined organizational trust as “the expectation of appropriate behavior in an organized setting based on the norms of that institution” (2007, p. 3). It’s the function of the organization. Relational trust supports the personal relationships developed in the work environment (Covey, 2006; Louis, 2007).

Makiewicz (2011) defined trust as an individual’s belief that the behavior of another individual or group is genuine, honest, and in the best interest of the organization. Covey (2009) acknowledged that trust is the core value that shapes what kind of organization you have, be it your company or your family. If the core value, “trust,” is present nobody notices it, but when it’s absent everyone notices it (Covey, 2009). Having trust is closely related to your “joy, your energy and prosperity” (Covey & Link, 2012, p. 25).

The findings of the study conducted by Tarter, Bliss, and Hoy (1989) on schools’ characteristics and teacher trust in the principal and in their colleagues identified behaviors that impact the schools’ climate and the level of trust teachers have in the principal. In this study Tarter et al. examined the dimensions of a school climate by surveying teachers’ perception of their work environment. The dimensions they examined were supportive and directive principal behaviors and engaged and frustrated teacher behaviors. They concluded that supportive and non-directive principal behaviors

along with engaged teachers created a positive school climate, which increased the trusting relationships found in a school. The principals' leadership styles were associated with the level of trust teachers had in their colleagues. Lastly, freedom to make professional decisions correlated to positive trust in their colleagues and in their school (Tarter et al., 1989).

Similar to Tarter et al. (1989), in a later study, Hoy et al. (2003) derived their definition of trust from Rokeach (1968) who defined trust as open and closed belief systems of individual personalities. In the study by Hoy et al. on school climate within 97 diverse geographic high schools in Ohio, they captured the perspectives of students, teachers, principals, and the community, through the use of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, developed by Halpin and Croft (1963), which was modified by Hoy et al. (2003) and other researchers. They measured the organizational school climate by correlating the schools' openness and schools' health to faculty trust. This study defined open schools as a school where the interactions among teachers, principals, and students are respectful and authentic. Healthy school climates foster positive relationships among their stakeholders and in their communities. In such climates, the principal is supportive and has high expectations. Teachers help each other. The principal and the teachers believe in the students, which resulted in students trusting teachers and the principal.

Kutsyruba, Walker, and Noonan (2011) conducted a qualitative exploratory study of 177 Canadian principals' perceptions on the restoration of trust, which revealed that trust was an important element needed for a school and ultimately for the students. Though some events can compromise trust, principals need to sincerely work on

rebuilding and restoring trust “because it is worth the effort in the long run” (Kutsyuruba et al., 2011, p. 88) in ensuring positive working relationships with all constituents. The results also revealed that, when the trust is broken between principal and teacher, the consequence for the teacher can be an abuse of power, such as retaliation. Whereas, the consequence against the principal would be hyper-vigilance. These demoralizing interactions in a school can impact student achievement (Kutsyuruba et al., 2011).

Louis (2007) discovered that trust was the common thread discussed in the results of the five schools she researched. She found that trust in schools is dependent upon behaviors exhibited by the administrators and teachers. Those behaviors are: collaboration, integrity, concern, competence, reliability, and sincerity (Louis, 2007). Louis further claims that the administrator needs to assess the current level of trust in his or her building prior to initiating a significant change. He or she also must include all teachers in the important decisions of the school, monitor the trust level of the school, never assume that trust is a constant, and reflect on his or her own leadership behaviors and the impact they have on trust levels (Louis, 2007).

Covey (2009) shared 13 behaviors that leaders must exhibit in order to build and maintain trust. Leaders must talk straight, show respect, create transparency, right wrongs, show loyalty, deliver results, get better, confront reality, clarify expectations, practice accountability, listen first, keep commitments, and extend trust first. Trust levels can change within a school if one of the behaviors described by Covey (2009), Louis (2007), and Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (1999) are extreme. These behaviors have to be balanced. One trusting behavior cannot overshadow the other. For this reason, the administrator needs to consistently reflect on their leadership behaviors and the impact

they may or may not have on the levels of trust in a school (Covey, 2009; Louis, 2007; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1999).

To rebuild trust, principals must first tell the truth. They must recognize the loss of trust, determine where and when the trust was lost, what trust elements were compromised, confront the reason why trust was lost, recognize the impact of loss of trust, state how trust will be repaired, and consistently reflect on the progress of trust (Kutsyruba et al., 2011; Tschannen-Moran 2009; Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2004). Similarly, Tarter et al. (1989) shared the importance of supportive behaviors in principals when they engage their constituents in rebuilding trust.

The qualitative study conducted by Kutsyruba et al. (2011) of 177 Canadian principals, found that the most difficult challenge these principals faced was broken trust. Their exploratory study examined the perception of their school's ethical challenges, leadership pressures, school influences, and their ethical decision-making process in recovering trust in their schools. Literature was reviewed related to restoring trust in schools prior to conducting their qualitative study with principals. They asked the participants two open-ended questions: "In your experience, what key factors help the successful resolution of low trust situations? What is one piece of advice you would give to a beginning principal about repairing trust?" (Kutsyruba et al., 2011, p. 12). They discovered the same thread that several researchers found regarding broken trust and rebuilding trust when it is lost. Each of the participating principals believed restoring trust was worthwhile and is best for the school. Kutsyruba et al. (2011) revealed the following from their interviews: The principals believed they were the violators of the trust in the school because they took their stakeholders for granted. The principals

believed they caused trust to be broken because of the demands they placed on the teachers. These principals took steps to mediate and resolve the issue. Principals found that restored trust was stronger than before because they learned from their mistakes. Kutsyuruba et al. (2011) concluded that principals should continue to rebuild, restore, or cultivate trust in their schools. Moreover, Tschannen-Moran's (2014), *Trust Matters: Leadership for Successful Schools*, added "When trust is given to the 'trustor' there are expectations that are assumed allowing the 'trustee' to feel vulnerable. If those expectations are not met, then the trustee may respond with the desire of revenge and resentment" (p. 97). Although conversations to restore damaged trust are uncomfortable and daunting, they are necessary for a principal to have with their stakeholders (Kutsyuruba et al., 2011; Tschannen-Moran, 2014).

Studies from Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999, 2007), Tschannen-Moran (2001, 2009), Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000), Bryk and Schneider (1996, 2002), Adams (2013), and Goddard (2003) discussed leadership, the importance of trust, and its effect on student achievement. Their research showed that, in schools, a high level of trust was a strong predictor of positive student outcomes as well as a critical element for school improvement and sustaining an effective school culture (The Character Education Partnership, 2010).

Similarly, Adams' (2013) study assessed the validity of collective trust as a social indicator of instructional capacity. Teachers who trusted their principals would perform better and were willing to complete the assignments required. Adams also proposed that principals should leverage teacher resources in order to have meaningful performance

information. The principal cultivates the trust found in schools. Tschannen-Moran (2014) stated in *Trust Matters: Leadership for Successful Schools*,

Although teachers trust in their colleagues stems directly from their own behavior and not from the behavior of the principal, there is much the principal can do to establish a professional learning community grounded in trust. As principal you can make the time and create the structures to facilitate collaboration and allow for professional discourse and shared decision making among teachers. The principal can foster openness by encouraging teachers to be in on each other's classroom to observe one another's classrooms. Establishing a successful peer observation program requires planning and training to build safety and trust teachers need. (p. 150)

In other words, "The principal sets the tone for teachers to trust one another" (Tschannen-Moran, 2014, p. 151). Principals can impact the teachers' willingness to share pedagogical approaches and resources.

As Hoerr (2005) shared in *The Art of School Leadership*, a principal will need to be persistent and courageous as they will be challenged based on shared assumptions about students, curriculum, colleagues, and administration. It behooves the principal to find productive ways, such as the use of protocols, to address those challenges through respectful non-judgmental discourse. Principals need to create a school culture that exudes clear expectation of what is important to make the school better (p. 31). Lastly, the principals' supervision is to develop and facilitate a trusting collegial setting that allows for growth and learning with all stakeholders.

In agreement with the work of Tschannen-Moran (2014), Fullan (2014), Bryk et al. (2010), and Sparks (2008), specified that principals need to create intentional collaboration in order to have productive learning communities focused on student learning. Collaboration should focus on expectations, roles and responsibilities, cycles of learning/professional development, and consistencies with protocols. As Hoerr (2005) stated, a trusting collegial culture is where teachers grow and student improvement is impacted by the teachers' growth.

The principal is charged with upholding the school's mission and vision, engaging all stakeholders, managing the systemic structures of a school building, ensuring that staff members receive relevant and meaningful support, and evaluating the effectiveness of all staff members (Bryk & Schneider, 2002). To get this done teachers and principals must trust each other's competence and integrity. This positive culture, as described by Santoyo (2012), is mirrored in the study by Hoy et al. (2003) which described a healthy school:

A healthy school climate is imbued with positive student, teacher, parent and administrator interrelationships. Teachers like their colleagues, their school, their job, and their students and they are driven by a quest for academic excellence. They believe in themselves and their students and set high, but achievable goals. Students work hard and respect others who do well academically. Principal behavior is also positive; that is, it is friendly and supportive. Principals have high expectations for teachers and go out of their way to help teachers. (Hoy et al., 2003, p. 39)

Similarly, Fullan (2014) stated that the principals are to model their trustworthiness, competence, and integrity; then monitor those behaviors in themselves and in others in order to secure a positive culture aimed at maximizing the potential in students, and teachers.

Positive school cultures embody trust (Goddard, 2003). Trust is the adhesive (Adams, 2013), the essential ingredient (Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2014), the glue that keeps the learning community united (Adams, 2013) to address school improvement. Trust is essential for academic achievement (Bryk & Schneider, 2002). Trust impacts the school's culture (Saphier & King, 1985).

More than 30 years ago, Saphier and King (1985) noted that if school culture is strong, improvement in instruction will be significant, continuous, and widespread. School culture, as described by McCollum and Yoder (2011), "helps define the organization of the school, the vision espoused, as well as the academic standards established and social skills promoted and developed in their students" (p. 66). By the same token, Santoyo, author of *Leverage Leadership* (2012), stated that positive staff cultures do not derive from irreplicable charisma, but from the careful development of habits that build strong staff community where teachers are willing to be held accountable and willing to make the effort to bring the school's vision to fruition.

The classroom is another social structure in the school building where exchanges between the teacher and student can involve risks, vulnerability, and cooperation that impacts the level of trust (Tschannen-Moran, 2014). Teachers and students spend a minimum of 180 days per year in school. Students spend at least 6 hours a day in schools. During this time, teaching and learning experiences are exchanged and the

development of trusting or distrusting relationships are formed (Bryk & Schneider, 2002).

The teacher is of one of the most important stakeholders in a school building. The interactions the teachers have with students and the principal can benefit the school or can hinder the school (Makiewicz, 2011; Tschannen-Moran, 2014). Makiewicz (2011) in her dissertation, explored the development of trust in schools and how it flourishes. Her research focused on relational trust of 377 teachers with their principals within 13 elementary schools. In her study she used a modified survey instrument that explored the principal's worthiness and interaction with vital stakeholders, the teachers experience with trust, and the similarities between the principal's and teachers' background. Makiewicz (2011) concluded that teachers were willing to work with new initiatives if the teachers trusted the principal's worthiness. She also concluded that frequent interactions between the principal and teacher increased the teacher's trust in the principal.

In the study by McCollum and Yoder (2011) the decline of students' grade performance levels in middle schools were assessed. They proposed that students' perceptions of their relationships with their teachers impact their perception of school climate and their future academic aspirations. In their mixed methods study, they examined 1,462 seventh graders' perceptions of academic culture, their academic aspirations, and student-teacher relationships. The study consisted of face-to-face interviews and a 30-minute self-administered questionnaire that focused on social and psychological adolescent development behaviors through adulthood. Students' perceptions of their school's academic climate were a strong indicator of their perception

of academic aspiration. Students who held their teachers in favorable regard had positive perceptions of school climate and academic aspiration. Their findings also suggested the importance of teachers' roles in developing interpersonal relationships with their students, especially for middle school students. If teachers forge these trusting relationships with their students, the school environment will be conducive to learning and the students will develop appropriately throughout their educational endeavors (McCollum & Yoder, 2011).

Teachers, along with other staff members, must be involved in creating and cultivating trust (Roby, 2011). Similar to Tschannen-Moran's book, *Trust Matters for School Improvement* (2014) and to Jensen's book, *Teaching Children with Poverty in Mind* (2009), teachers can collectively work on building trust by understanding the factors that influence it. Such factors include teachers' values, experiences, and attitudes. In *Trust Matters: Leadership for Successful Schools*, Tschannen-Moran (2014) elaborated on the need for teachers to trust one another in order to directly impact student learning and teacher morale. She stated, "Cultural norms in a professional learning community can facilitate trust by encouraging cooperation rather than competition between teachers. Cooperative cultures foster trusting and trust worthy behaviors not only among teachers and staff but among students" (p. 128). She also stated, "A sense of benevolence or care lays a foundation of trust among teachers. Honesty, openness, and reliability also play a role. An interesting pattern of trust emerges, when teachers lack respect for the competence of their principal" (p. 129). Tschannen-Moran (2014) also stated, "trust plays an important role in overcoming barriers to building a professional learning community

which include conflict avoidance, destructive competitiveness, and low levels of teacher self-efficacy” (p. 140).

Both Jensen (2009) and Tschannen (2014) agree that the absence of trust among teachers is an impediment to teacher collaboration. When trust is present, teachers feel supported by their colleagues, and principals and are more willing to make themselves vulnerable when working with colleagues. This affects classroom practices and interventions which are essential to achieving positive student outcomes. Adams (2013) suggested that when there is distrust, teachers are more reluctant to share teaching practices. This is especially true in high poverty schools. When teachers trust each other there is a sense of efficacy with regard to achieving the school’s goals. These behaviors will also have an impact on the faculty and on their collective effort to affect positive student outcomes in high poverty schools.

In an earlier study, Tschannen-Moran and Barr (2004) stated that if there is a negative impact on the norms or expectations between “trustor and trustee,” then the trust can weaken. Their study of collective teacher efficacy found a strong correlation between collective teacher efficacy and student achievement in eighth grade math, writing, and English tests in the sampling of 66 middle schools from the Commonwealth of Virginia. Collective teacher efficacy as they define it is “The collective self-perception that teachers in a given school make an educational difference to their students over and above the educational impact of their homes and communities” (Tschannen-Moran & Barr, 2004, p. 189). This includes the belief and trust that teachers can create positive change in their students’ lives.

Similarly, Demir's (2015) research, which consisted of 378 teachers working in 21 public primary schools, found that the trust of school teachers is correlated to the supportive behaviors of school administrators. Demir's findings are similar to the findings of Tschannen-Moran (2001), where staff participation in decision-making created an environment of mutual trust between teacher and principal. This relational trust can become an effective way to reduce uncertainty in a school.

Research by Bryk and Schneider (1996) yielded findings similar to those of Tschannen-Moran (2001, 2009) and Demir (2015). They engaged in quantitative research throughout the Chicago, IL Public Schools. They found that schools with high trust demonstrated improvement in student learning and achievement. The research uncovered connections between collegial trust and (a) teacher willingness and efforts to innovate in the midst of reform initiatives, (b) public problem solving within schools, (c) social controls that develop within teacher communities, and (d) teacher commitment and attachment to the school and its mission. The principals' behaviors were also found to contribute to developing and sustaining relational trust (Bryk & Schneider 2002). Many educational researchers' results were similar to Demir's results. When the level of trust is high, teachers are willing to accept new initiatives and will affect student motivation to perform; therefore, the principal is charged with the responsibility of monitoring and reflecting on the level of trust in the school (Goddard et al., 2009; Santoyo, 2012; Tschannen-Moran, 2014).

Students are the customers. They have to trust the principal, teachers, and parents (Jensen, 2013). Goddard (2003) conceded that successful educational experiences are influenced by the individuals' behaviors and disposition. This is most significant when

students have the support and care from their families, school, and community.

Academic precision and achievement are obtained in students who have a strong support network. These strong support networks are positive indicators of academic success (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Goddard, 2003).

Trust in schools has always been important for families. For a parent to allow a school to care for their child's educational well-being takes courage and a measure of vulnerability. There are no guarantees that their child will reap all that their school has to offer (Tschannen-Moran, 2012).

Parent engagement is imperative to the development of trust within the school. Schools create networks that can unite parents, teachers, and the community. These networks are needed for the success of the school. Adams et al. (2009), researched the antecedents of parent trust toward schools. They randomly selected 79 schools and 578 parents from a Midwestern state. Each school is composed of its unique identity, characteristics, culture, and practices. Their research focused on the guiding question related to the differences of trust found in various schools. They theorized that no two schools are alike. They posed two hypotheses: first, parent-school trust would be different across schools; second, school culture would influence parent-school trust. They found that parent-school trust varied across the schools depending on the environment and location of the school. Contrary to what many might assume, parent trust is not low in high poverty schools simply because they are plagued with challenges.

As with all schools, when parents are treated as outsiders and not included in school decisions or functions, trust in high poverty schools is lessened. When the school community is included in decision making and is communicated with, the school is

perceived to be trustworthy. They also found that when parents in high poverty settings distrust teachers, it is based on their experience, the interactions with the teacher, and on the reputation of the teacher (Adams et al., 2009).

Inviting parents to become active members of the school requires an enormous amount of trust (Tschannen-Moran, 2014). Trust is needed for the transition from parent-school independence to interdependence (Adams & Forsyth, 2010; Adams et al., 2009). Collaborative practices with parents increased the parents' level of trust with the school. Parents were willing to openly discuss their child's developmental needs, the school's expectations, and their role in their child's education. As shared and supported in the research of Tschannen-Moran and Barr (2004), Adams et al. (2009), and Hoy, Tarter, and Hoy, (2006), parents are more likely to trust schools when their child is academically engaged and motivated, whereas poor performance and behavioral problems lead to distrust.

Importance of Trust in High Poverty Schools

Jensen (2009) author of *Teaching with Poverty in Mind*, stated,

Poor children are more likely than well-off children to attend poorly maintained schools with less qualified teachers. Bridges of trust can be more difficult for teachers to build with low-income families because teachers are less confident that they share the same cultural values and ethical standards. (p. 11)

Teachers can have trusting relationships with high poverty students if they show empathy rather than pity. Principals can support this by changing the culture of care and not giving up on high poverty students (Jensen, 2009).

The research by Cuthrell, Stapleton, and Ledford (2010), identified key strategies that were important to developing a strong support system for children living in poverty. They examined scholarly literature focusing upon elements that affect students living in poverty. One essential component they advocated for was the importance of a positive school environment. They contend that positive environments within a classroom positively affect the development of high poverty students.

Similarly, Goddard (2003) conducted a descriptive study related to social networks students develop in a school. This study was conducted in 1998 with 45 elementary schools in a large urban district. The final sample of participants consisted of 444 teachers and 2,429 fourth grade students who were scheduled to take the state assessments. The teachers completed an anonymous survey one month before the administration of the test. The research was designed to add to the body of research regarding trust as a social capital and its impact on student academic success. Their hypothesis was confirmed. The 45 schools' students who had high levels of social capital such as trust, support, and strong relationships, earned a higher proficiency rate on their literacy and math state assessments.

In the study conducted by Goddard et al. (2009) the results were measured by a 14 item 5-point, Likert-like scale survey distributed in 150 Michigan public elementary schools, which indicated that trust was a positive predictor of academic achievement, whereas race and economic disadvantage were not predictors of academic achievement. The study also revealed that trust is most strained in schools that serve a large proportion of high poverty students and students of color.

In *Engaging Students with Poverty in Mind Practical Strategies for Raising Student Achievement*, Jenson (2013) stated that when teachers cannot or will not connect personally, students are less likely to trust their teachers. Students want to know who their teacher really is, and they want the teaching to connect to their world. Trust can affect the student's morale, self-esteem, and self-worth. Trust is essential for students to deal with uncertainty, unpredictability, and risk in high poverty schools (Kutsyuruba et al., 2011; Jensen, 2013).

The research conducted by Tschannen, Bankole, Mitchell, and Moore (2013) on student academic optimism assessed students' perception of their relationship with teachers, of their academic press, and of their connection with the school environment in a high poverty school. Academic press refers to the students' efficacy and their perseverance. Their study evaluated the perception of elementary, middle school, and high school students in 49 schools in one urban school district in the mid-Atlantic region of the US. A total of 34,000 students, ages 8-17 were studied. The survey was comprised of five items from a student trust scale. Their rationale for the study was to gauge if students' perception of relationships impacted their learning outcomes. They hypothesized that students prefer to have relationships with people who are accessible, are responsive, and encourage and support curiosity and risk taking. These relationships could influence the students' belief that the school is an environment where they belong, can be successful, and has high expectations for their educational endeavors. These results found a strong and significant relationship between student trust, academic press, and student identification with school and strong student outcomes in English and math.

The implications of their findings suggest that teachers need to cultivate trust by demonstrating that they are open, reliable, and benevolent to high poverty students.

According to Milner (2013), research focused on trust in high poverty schools has been based on the “inside school factors” and not on the “outside of school factors” and their effect on trust. Milner described outside-of-school factors such as unemployment, parenting styles, family income, parent educational level, location, health care, and resources found in the homes. Inside school factors include curriculum, pedagogy, school resources or lack thereof, leadership practices, and school climate. Milner (2013) reviewed the database of peer reviewed articles over the last 10 years in order to create a thematic historical review of the relationship between race and poverty and its impact on teaching and learning. He used the critical race theory lens to consider how school systems have been oppressive and inequitable in dealing with marginalized groups because of their ingrained policies and practices.

Milner (2013) suggested that students living in poverty are dependent upon the school. Schools provide resources for breakfast, lunch, academic intervention, school excursions, and at times, health care services. Similar to sociologist Noguera (2003), Milner affirmed that economically disadvantaged students have a very difficult time succeeding in school without these supports. Milner’s study further revealed the obstacles high poverty students face when teacher retention rates are low:

- Teacher absence is higher in high poverty schools causing instability in the educational process.
- Often, teachers lack commitment and persistence which causes students to fall behind.

- Teachers are often teaching outside of their license or field of study (Milner, 2013).

Nationally, Curtis (2012) examined mathematics (high school and middle school) teachers' rationale for becoming teachers and for leaving their schools. She also connected the expectations and reality of teaching in hopes of improving mathematics teachers' retention rate. In her study, she asserted that there has been an increase in mathematics teachers graduating from teacher training program but there is a shortage of mathematics teachers in low performing schools. She stated high poverty schools' teachers leave teaching within the first 3 years and that the role of the principal is critical for new teachers.

A random sampling of 5,000 middle and high school teachers were asked to participate in the study. Only 1,572 teachers responded to her 4-point Likert scale survey. Her survey required the participants' to rate their satisfaction level in teaching and whether they would choose to be a teacher again. Based on the results from the survey, 32 randomly selected teachers who were contemplating leaving the profession were interviewed. The results revealed that teachers were less satisfied with being a teacher; if they were to start over, they would not become teachers. This was especially true in high poverty schools. Both Curtis (2012) and Milner (2013), in their research, found the following:

- Teacher retention rates at high poverty schools are lower than those at high performing schools. Many new teachers quit teaching within the first 3three years because of the low salary, teacher blame, the demands of NCLB, and lack of administrative support.

- New educators in high poverty schools serve a minimum of 5 years then leave to move to a more attractive school.

Tschannen-Moran (2014) asserted that for students living in poverty, relationship building is imperative for their development and success. Positive relationships between the student and teacher, which create a welcoming environment, can influence the students' effort and attitude toward learning. Trust and family engagement impacts the value of education. When there is a supportive, trusting school and family environment, students are more likely to be committed to the learning process. Principals will need to assure parents that the school is deeply committed to their child's educational well-being. They also need to ensure that teachers trust students and parents. They must validate teachers' professional competence and maintain open lines of communication and involve parents in the school's decision making process (Tschannen-Moran, 2014).

The study conducted by Tschannen-Moran and Barr (2004) also found that student achievement was directly linked to a students' socioeconomic status. This means students with lower socioeconomic status tended to have lower achievement results. Similar to an earlier study of Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999), they concluded that low levels of trust lead to low levels of student performance, whereas high levels of trust lead to high levels of student performance. They propose the following: teachers need to observe other teacher practices and share best practices in order to provide a rich learning experience that will produce high student achievement; Principals can encourage and promote collective teacher efficacy by assisting teachers with the development of student mastery goals coupled with actionable feedback on their pedagogy.

National Reform Movement and the Impact on Trust in High Poverty Schools

A complex system of day to day exchanges in a school determines the success of the school. But, for more than 30 years, the politics of school reform has been the prevailing conversation of policy makers as they have ignored those complexities. Reform efforts, such as No Child Left Behind, the Common Core Standards, and the Teacher/Principal Evaluation Systems are all daunting. Accountability requirements placed on principals do not take into account the many conditions that must be met in order to improve the achievement of high poverty students.

Closing the achievement gap and strengthening leadership practices and relationships without the support of reformers seems impossible (Romero, 2015). Reformers and politicians believe that if schools set rigorous standards, provide rigorous standard bearing assessments, and hold educators accountable, schools will improve (Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2015). However, they do not consider elements of social capital, such as the levels of trust in a school community (Fullan, 2014).

The building of relationships and trust is a practice that significantly impacts teaching and learning, yet is not found in school reforms (Romero, 2015; Tschannen-Moran, 2014). Teachers and principals must trust each other's competence and integrity. These mutual trust dependencies are woven into the daily function of a school environment, but are not considered by school reform policy makers (Daly, 2009; Romero, 2015). Adams (2013) believed that state and district initiatives cause tension in schools. He stated the following:

Contention often erupts because of the different views on how to improve achievement and close achievement gaps. Many prevailing beliefs in the USA

favor carrot and stick strategies like increasing input into schools, raising accountability standards, adopting performance pay plans, and using value-added evaluation models. Such improvement strategies partly assume achievement problems stem from unmotivated or incapable educators in need of external reinforcement. Less attention has been directed on high leverage resources. (Adams, 2013, p. 376)

In 1983, a federal report, *A Nation at Risk* (Gardner, 1983) was released, that compared public education in the US to international schools. The report raised concerns and was critical of the performance of American schools and students (Gardner, 1983). Chicago's public schools were singled out and criticized for their poor performance. This caused many policy makers to question the competence of the people who work in public education in Chicago.

The response to this very critical report was the Chicago School Reform Act of 1988 which proposed to transform 550 Chicago schools through the collective effort of all school constituents (Bryk & Schneider, 1996). This reform effort was the subject of their 5year study, "Chicago Public School, Social Trust: A Moral Resource for School Improvement." Bryk and Schneider (1996) found results similar to those in Bryk's earlier study on Catholic schools in Chicago. He found that relational trust was needed in order to address the reform demands. Bryk and Schneider (1996) posited that,

Parents in the Catholic schools depended on the teachers' professional judgment on what and how to teach and they supported teacher efforts in this regard. The professionals operated under a moral obligation to do what was

best to advance the education and welfare of each child. (Bryk & Schneider, 1996, p. 3)

In *Improving the Education of Children Living in Poverty*, Murnane (2007) suggested that the educational opportunities shared in school reforms are more rhetoric than reality in our nation. He elaborated on amendments needed to strengthen the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB, 2002) which would assist the capacity of schools in high poverty areas to increase high poverty students' achievement levels. First, he proposed changing accountability measures that are attainable in schools where students are measured on progress rather than proficiency levels. Second, he proposed that Congress provide incentives to high poverty schools that demonstrate improvement. Lastly, he proposed providing competitive matching grants to boost the number of high performing schools in districts which have a large number of low performing schools. Murnane (2007) believed that with an increased expenditure of 2.5 billion dollars to 5 billion dollars spent on education nationally, these amendments would improve accountability, create incentives for states to act, and build the capacity of schools to educate high poverty students.

Similarly, Trujillo, Hernandez, Jarrell, and Kissell, (2014) investigated the support for, or opposition to, community based reform in the Oakland Unified School District. The purpose of the study was to explore the constituents' perception and interpretation of the district's policies. They analyzed the oral history interview data of eight constituents who represented the district. The participants selected worked or lived in Oakland for decades and had experienced different reform efforts. These participants

included a high school student, a teacher, a principal, a superintendent, a former city official, and a leader of an educational reform organization. Trujillo et al. (2014) stated, Stakeholders who occupy the most powerful community positions usually have a greater access to and knowledge of how to voice their preferences and needs. The most marginalized community members are often systematically excluded from the most ambitious democratic initiatives. (p. 896)

Historically the Oakland Unified School District had tension with their community because educators did not include the voices of the community when decisions were made about their schools. Trujillo et al. recognized that the degree of trust can vary among the constituents and can vary based on the dynamics of the community. Their study also explored the level of trust and its impact on the community's engagement with educators. Their results are similar to those of the social capital theory, namely that trust is needed to impact relationships. Unfortunately for the Oakland community, in this study, past history of negative experiences with the school district's educators and special interest groups overshadowed the community's trust and made the constituents apprehensive to act on the educational reforms. Their research shed light on the need to have a democratic and authentic collaboration, where all parties' voices are heard, regarding school reforms.

Principals are caught in the crossfire between policy makers' reform and teacher buy-in to the reform's progress goals. Principals have to cultivate trust in their schools even if they do not agree with the demands of the reforms. Skepticism from the principal can lead to the communities' apprehension on implementing the practices of the reforms. The principal's and reformers' failure to follow through with their intended promise can

cause distrust with the school's stakeholders. This can be perceived by the trustor (the stakeholders) as betrayal, deception, or dishonesty causing trust to plummet into distrust (Covey, 2006; Kutsyuruba, et al., 2011; Murnane, 2007; Tschannen-Moran, 2014).

In order to create collective trust among all stakeholders, policy makers need to consider how schools invest in their constituents (Adams, 2013). As shown in Adams' study, and also in the works of Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999; 2007), and Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (2000), factors of school culture such as trust and its direct impact on student achievement need to be assessed and identified in order to build a school's capacity for improvement. Similarly, Louis (2007) found that in schools with a high level of trust, teachers were willing to change and work with new innovations, whereas in schools with substantial distrust, teachers were unwilling to change.

Chapter Summary

This literature review began with the definition and description of trust in an organization. Next the literature review analyzed the importance of trust and leadership and the effects and importance of trust among school stakeholders in high poverty schools. Finally, throughout the review, educational researchers criticized the educational reform movement of the past 40 years and its impact on trust. Principals' trusting practices were shared and the levels of trust school stakeholders had with the school was discussed (Bryk, et al., 2010; Fullan, 2014; Hoy, 2012; Tschannen-Moran, 2014).

As the theorists in this literature review have explained, trust is dependent on the relationships developed by all members of the school community. Trust can be maintained, broken, and restored (Kutsyuruba, et al., 2011; Tschannen-Moran, 2014). Trust is based on competence, respect, personal regard, and integrity among

members of the community (Tschannen-Moran, 2014; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2000; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 1999). Principals are reminded in the research that distrust causes teachers to spend time guarding their vulnerability rather than improving instructional practices (Covey, 2006). Principals are reminded that trust from parents and students lead to school engagement and improved student achievement (Jensen, 2013; Tschannen-Moran; 2014). Lastly, principals are reminded that successful schools are dependent on effective leadership and trusting relationships (Bryk et al., 2010).

The research presented in this dissertation does not discuss the principals' level of trust in their stakeholders because such research does not exist. Yet, principals are the catalyst in building trusting relationships among their stakeholders (Fullan, 2014).

Although the research relates the practices and behaviors a principal must demonstrate to build, maintain, and cultivate trust, the principal is never asked, "Whom do you trust?"

Chapter 3: Research Design Methodology

Introduction

Principals are the backbones of a school and their leadership should be geared to support the vision, mission, and the culture of the school. They represent stability in high poverty school communities and perform their role in the face of adversity with courage and grace (Fullan, 2014). The principals' actions and leadership behaviors are correlated to the school's success. "Without a principal's leadership efforts to raise student achievement, a school community cannot succeed" (Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2004, p. 573).

Hoy et al., (2003), Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999, 2007), Tschannen-Moran (2001, 2009, 2014), Tschannen-Moran and Hoy, (2000), and Goddard (2003) discussed the impact of leadership and its effect on school culture and student achievement in high poverty schools based on quantitative surveys administered to teachers, students, and parents. These researchers focused on the trust that parents, teachers, and students had in their principals and in their schools; however, the inverse is largely absent from the literature. This study contributed to the current research on relational trust conducted by Bryk and Schneider (1999, 2002), Hoy and Tschannen-Moran (1999, 2007), Tschannen-Moran and Gareis (2004), and Tschannen-Moran and Hoy, (2000) in high poverty schools by addressing principals' levels of trust in their stakeholders. Although it is logical to assume that trust is a crucial factor in the development and maintenance of a

successful school, most research has fallen short of examining and assessing the role of the principals' level of relational trust in their major stakeholders.

A quantitative descriptive research method was selected because it “aims to cast light on current issues and problems through a process of data collection that enables a researcher to describe the situation more completely” (Fox & Bayat, 2007, p. 45). The research utilized a combination of three surveys: (a) Principals Trust Survey (Tschannen-Moran, 1999), (b) Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (Hoy, 2003), and (c) Organizational Climate Index (Hoy, 2001, 2002). They informed the development of a new tool that helped to answer the following questions:

1. To what extent do principals of high poverty urban middle schools trust their parents, teachers, and students?
 - 1a. Are the high poverty urban middle school principals' level of trust in parents, teachers, and students significantly correlated with one another?
2. To what extent do the principals of high poverty urban middle schools report that they have used supportive, restrictive, collegial, and directive leadership behaviors?
 - 2a. Are the high poverty urban middle school principals' reporting of the four types of leadership behavior significantly correlated with one another?
3. To what extent are the principals' endorsements of the five faces of trust correlated when applied to trust in stakeholders?
4. To what extent are the principals' endorsements of the five faces of trust correlated when applied to self-reported leadership behaviors?

Research Context

This study was conducted in a school district located in an urban northeastern city where there are 87 principals and 3,542 teachers. These schools serve 45,804 Kindergarten through 12th grade students across 87 schools. Of the total K-12th grade student population served in this region, 85% or 38,933 are classified as Title I students. This indicates that the students are eligible for free and reduced lunch as defined by federal guidelines. The district's teacher turnover rate for 2015 and 2016 school year was 19%. The turnover rate for teachers with fewer than 5 years of teaching was 22.5% whereas the turnover rate for those with fewer than 3 years of teaching was 16%. Of the 87 schools, 29 schools have a middle school component with the following configurations; three are K-8, 19 are sixth grade-eighth grade, and seven are sixth grade-12th grade schools. This study focused on the 28 middle schools within the northeastern urban school district; one middle school was eliminated as the researcher is its principal.

These northeastern region schools have not met their annual yearly progress targets for the last 5 years as set by the state education department in English language arts, and mathematics. These same schools have not met their annual yearly progress for students who were English language learners and students with disabilities. The proficiency levels (levels 3 and 4) for the schools in the district are as follows: 23% ELA proficiency and 9% math proficiency for K-eighth grade students; 20% ELA proficiency and 15% math proficiency for sixth-eighth grade students; and 24% ELA proficiency and 15% math proficiency for sixth-12th grade students. (NYSED, 2016b, 2016e, 2016f)

Research Participants

A total population sampling consisted of 28 middle school principals from a northeastern region of an urban school district was conducted. The principals in this study have a minimum of a masters' degree and state certification in school leadership. The 28 principals who received the survey have 1-12 years of administrative experience in the school system. There were 15 male principals and 13 female principals. There were 15 principals who have less than 5 years of experience and 13 principals who have 6 to 12 years of experience in their current position. Based on the years of experience, 15 principals were working towards completing their probationary period within 3 years, whereas the other 13 principals completed their probationary period and were tenured in their current position.

Instruments Used in Data Collection

Qualtrics Software was utilized to create a survey (see Appendix A that is a modified combination of the Principal Trust Survey (PTS) developed by Tschannen-Moran (1999), the Organizational Climate Description (OCD) and the Organizational Climate Index (OCI) Surveys developed by Hoy (2001, 2002). The PTS is a reliable and valid survey used with 642 principals in the Ohio and Virginia area that calculated a standardized score which compared the principals' survey results to other principals' survey results in the same area. A factor analysis was used to norm the validity of the results. The factors were principals' trust in teachers, principals' trust in students, and principals' trust in parents (Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2004). The normed score for principal trust in teachers was $SD = .87$, for principal trust in students it was $SD = .87$, and for principal trust in parents it was $SD = .86$ (see Appendix B).

Hoy's OCD and OCI surveys were used to measure the behaviors found in an organizations' climate. A factor analysis was used to norm the validity of the results of each of the subscales identified in each of the surveys. For this research, the survey instrument, OCI and OCD, were modified and four subscales were used to answer the research questions. Those subscales include the collegial leadership subscale of the OCI and the directive, supportive, and restrictive leadership subscales of the OCD. Each of the subscales was measured separately for each survey. The reliability scores for the OCI subscale behavior, collegial leadership was $SD = .94$; the reliability scores for OCD subscale behaviors were supportive $SD = .96$, directive $SD = .88$, and restrictive $SD = .89$ (see Appendix C and Appendix D).

The modified survey included a total of 48 statements divided into two sections. The first section of the survey, Principals' Trust Scale Survey (PTS), included 20 statements that assess the principal's trust in their parents, students, and teachers (see Appendix E). The second section of the survey, Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) and Organizational Climate Index (OCI), included 28 statements that assess collegial leadership, supportive, restrictive, and directive principal behaviors (see Appendix F). Permission has been granted by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran to use their survey instruments for academic research (see Appendix G). There were two modifications made to the survey and scoring guide. The first modification made to the surveys was replacing the word, principal, with "I." For example, if the statement said, "The *principal* explores all..." the statement changed to "I explore all..." so that the principals can respond to the statements from their perspective. The second modification made to the survey scoring guide was replacing the word "schools" with "principal/s."

To establish content validity, a survey was developed to investigate the correlation of this study's survey to the faces of trust. A panel of three to five experts read the definition of the characteristics of trust from the five faces of trust, then matched the 46 out of the 48 statements combined from the three surveys to benevolence, reliability, honesty, competence, or openness. Of the 48 statements, two statements were not compared to the behaviors of trust as those statements ask the principal for their trust in their stakeholders (see Appendix D). The experts matched the characteristics of trust as defined by five faces of trust, with the principal's trust in stakeholders and the principal's leadership as stated in the OCI and OCD survey instrument. The experts have been or are principals/directors of a public school who have a school administrator's license and a minimum of a master's degree with at least 5 years of experience in education. The researcher conducted an inter-rater reliability test to ensure consistent understanding of the survey. In the event statements have conflicting determinations, the researcher made the final determination based on the definition of the five faces of trust. This panel of principals were part of this study.

The PTS statements measured with a 6-point Likert type scale with 1 representing strongly disagree, to 6 representing strongly agree. The OCI and OCDQ measured on a 4-point Likert scale with 1 representing rarely occurs, to 4 representing very frequently occurs. Participants answered demographic questions related to their school, experience, level of education, additional training, type of school setting (K - eighth grade, sixth - eighth grade, or sixth-12th grade), gender, and ethnicity. The survey can be completed within 15 minutes. The survey responses were anonymously submitted through Qualtrics Software. Each participant received an invitation to a link to complete the survey via

email. Participants responded to the survey link without identifying any information such as their name or email address.

All participants received an informed consent form that provided information about the study and the online survey link via email. Online surveys have a response rate of about 30% (Fowler, 2014); however, this researcher hoped for at least a 60% response rate (20 principals). Participants were informed that their responses were voluntary, anonymous, and confidential. The results of this study were shared with participants who requested the results.

Procedures for Data Collection and Analysis

Surveys were distributed electronically to middle school principals. The researcher targeted 28 principals who met the requirements for participation; however, a minimum of 20 middle school principals were expected to complete the survey. Participants' responded to two sections. Responses were scored on a 1 to 6-point Likert type scale (first section) and a 1 to 4-point Likert type scale (second section). Responses were tallied by for each sub-section of the survey through Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS). Because some items are written as negative rather than positive statements, the response code needs to be reversed as per the scoring guide of Tschannen-Moran (2004) and Hoy (2001, 2002). This researcher used the scoring directions provided by both Hoy and Tschannen-Moran for the data analysis (see Appendix E, F, and G).

The first section measuring principals' trust in teachers, parents, and students yielded trust scores ranging from 20 to 120 as the highest for each stakeholder (parent, teacher, and students). This survey measured each subscale separately. The principals'

trust in teachers yielded a trust score ranging from 9 to 54. The principals' trust in students yielded trust score ranging from 6 to 36. The principals' trust in parents yielded a trust score from 5 to 30.

The second section of the survey measured the principal's leadership behaviors that foster or hinder trust. This section measuring collegial leadership, supportive, restrictive, and directive principal behaviors yielded scores ranging from 28 to 112 as the highest. This survey measured the subscales separately. Collegial leadership yielded scores ranging from 7 to 28. Supportive principal behaviors yielded scores ranging from 11 to 44. Restrictive principal behaviors yielded scores ranging from 4 to 16. Directive principal behaviors yielded scores ranging from 6 to 24.

Three separate instruments (PTS, OCI, and OCDQ) were combined into one survey instrument which included two sections. The first section (PTS) statements were measured on a 6-point Likert-like scale and the second section (OCI and OCDQ) were measured on a 4-point Likert-like scale. This survey instrument also collected data on the application of the concepts from the five faces of trust. There were 46 out of 48 statements that were applied to the concepts from the five faces of trust. There were 2 out of the 20 survey statements from the Principals' Trust Survey that were not applied to the concepts from the five faces of trust (I trust the students in this school. I trust the teachers in this school.).

The PTS configuration of the concepts from the five faces of trust were: six statements applied to the concept of reliable yielded scores ranging from 6 to 36; three statements applied to the concept of benevolence yielded scores ranging from 3 to 18; four statements applied to the concept of honesty yielded scores ranging from 4 to 24;

three statements applied to the concept of competence yielded scores ranging from 3 to 18; lastly, two statements applied to the concept of openness yielded scores ranging from 2 to 12.

The OCI and OCDQ (28 statements in total) configuration of the concepts from the five faces of trust were these: two statements applied to the concept of honesty yielded scores of 2 to 8; eight statements applied to the concept of benevolence yielded scores of 8 to 32; three statements applied to the concept of reliable yielded scores of 3 to 12; seven statements applied to the concept of competence yielded scores of 7 to 28; and eight statements applied to the concept of openness yielded scores of 8 to 32.

The data collected was stored and analyzed in Qualtrics Survey Software, then exported to SPSS for descriptive, inferential, and correlational analyses. Bivariate Pearson correlation was used to determine if the variables had significant correlations. A correlation is determined when there is a linear relationship between two continuous variables (Huck, 2012). The linear relationship between the variables determined if there were negative or positive correlations. If there were positive correlations the variables increased, whereas if there were negative correlations the variables decreased (Creswell, 2013; Huck 2012).

Bivariate Pearson correlation evaluated the statistical relationship between the Principal Trust Survey (parents, students, and teachers), Organizational Climate Surveys (restrictive, directive, collegial, and supportive), and to the application of the concepts from the five faces of trust (Huck, 2012). This analysis determined the relationship between the two independent variables, principals' demonstrated leadership behaviors and principals' trust, to the dependent variables, principal's level of trust in parents,

students, and teachers, and collegial, supportive, directive, and restrictive leadership behaviors. This analysis also evaluated the application of the concepts from the five faces of trust in the principals' leadership behaviors, and the principal's trust in his/her major stakeholders. The numerical value of a correlation ranges between -1.0 and +1.0, with a correlation (r) equal to zero indicating there is no relationship between the variables (AERD, 2017; Explorable, 2013; Huck, 2012). Finally, descriptive and inferential analyses were conducted to determine the minimum to maximum mean, the mean, and standard deviations of the survey responses.

Chapter Summary

Urban schools are under constant pressure to increase student achievement, but more attention must be paid to the conditions under which this goal may be accomplished. In high poverty schools, an increased level of trust between principal and teachers, as well as between students and parents, is a necessary prerequisite to success (Hoy, & Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Tschannen-Moran, 2014; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000). Much research has explored trust levels of teachers, students, and parents in their building leader, but there is scant information on the trust the principal has in his/her stakeholders. Trust as a social capital theory is the theoretical framework through which this work was processed, as it is essential in a school setting. However, trust is not the sole condition in a school setting, but it is a necessary condition when developing relationships (Putnam, 2000). This methodology focused on a quantitative descriptive research method. This study employed a survey that combined three reliable and validated surveys used by Tschannen (1999) and Hoy (2001, 2002) who studied relational trust in large school districts. The survey instruments focused on the

principals' level of trust in his/her major stakeholders, the principals' leadership behaviors, and the application of the concepts from the five faces of trust to the principals' level of trust and on their leadership behaviors. This study expands on the research literature regarding relational trust.

Chapter 4: Data Analysis

Introduction

Educational researchers have examined relational trust and its impact on school improvement (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Tschannen-Moran, 2014). This research is important for high poverty schools because success is dependent on the trusting relationships formed between and among stakeholders (Goddard et al., 2009; Jensen, 2013; Noguera, 2003). Educational researchers have often examined the level of trust teachers, parents, and students have in the principal and have recommended leadership practices for central and school level administrators (Hoy et al., 2003; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 2007; Louis, 2007). The purpose of this study was to include the principals' level of trust in their major stakeholders and their leadership behaviors.

Research demonstrates that principals are vital stakeholders in any school improvement initiative (Fullan, 2014). Principals need to establish trust in order for the stakeholders, including teachers, parents, and students, to support the school's instructional goals. Yet, there is little research that has examined the principals' level of trust in these same stakeholders. Gaining insight into the level of trust principals have in their major stakeholders and the leadership behaviors they employ will contribute to the research on relational trust. This study fills the void in the body of literature on relational trust by looking at trust from the perspective of the principal.

This descriptive, correlational study measured the principals' trust in their major stakeholders (teachers, parents, and students) and their self-reported leadership behaviors (supportive, collegial, directive, and restrictive). Principals anonymously reported their levels of trust in their stakeholders and the behaviors they think they display in their school settings. Additionally, this study applied the constructs from the five faces of trust (benevolence, openness, honesty, reliability, and competence) to determine, to what degree, principals endorsed those constructs in their trust of stakeholders and in their own leadership behaviors.

The researcher chose a quantitative method for this study. Descriptive analyses were employed to describe the principals' level of trust, their demonstrated leadership behaviors, and the behaviors identified in the concepts of the five faces of trust. Bivariate Pearson correlations were utilized to evaluate the statistical linear relationship between the constructs of the five faces of trust and the evaluations of stakeholders and leadership behaviors, respectively.

Research Questions

The research questions and null hypotheses were as follows:

1. To what extent do principals of high poverty urban middle schools trust their parents, teachers, and students?
 - 1a. Are the high poverty urban middle school principals' level of trust in parents, teachers, and students significantly correlated with one another?

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between and among the high poverty urban middle school principals' level of trust in their major stakeholders.

2. To what extent do the principals of high poverty urban middle schools report that they have used supportive, restrictive, collegial, and directive leadership behaviors?

2a. Are the high poverty urban middle school principals' reporting of the four types of leadership behaviors significantly correlated with one another?

Null Hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between and among the high poverty urban middle school principals' leadership behaviors.

3. To what extent are the principals' endorsements of the five faces of trust correlated when applied to trust in stakeholders?

Null Hypothesis: Endorsements of the five faces of trust are not correlated when applied to the principals' trust in stakeholders.

4. To what extent are the principals' endorsements of the five faces of trust correlated when applied to self-reported leadership behaviors?

Null Hypothesis: Endorsements of the five faces of trust are not correlated when applied to the self-reported leadership behaviors.

Data Analysis and Findings

The work related to trust and organizational climate of Hoy (2001, 2002) and Tschannen-Moran (2001, 2009, 2011) was the basis of this study. The survey statements compiled were designed to examine the principals' level of trust in their major stakeholders, their leadership behaviors, and the application to the concepts of the five faces of trust to the principals' level of trust in their major stakeholders and their leadership behaviors.

A panel of experts, which included two retired principals and three current principals, was selected to establish face validity of the concepts of the five faces of trust as they were applied to the survey questions. Two out of the 48 survey questions were not included as they directly asked the participants if they trust a specific stakeholder. The panel of experts applied the concepts of the five faces of trust to 46 statements. For 42 out of 46 of the statements, the panel unanimously concurred with the application from the five faces of trust. In these four instances when the panel did not unanimously agree, the researcher made the decision as to which of the five faces of trust, from those identified by the panel, was most applicable. Those statements have asterisks next to them (see Appendix H).

The Principal Trust Survey (PTS) (Tschannen-Moran, 1999) assessed the level of trust principals have in their major stakeholders (parents, students, and teachers) in 20 statements. The Organizational Climate Index (OCI) Survey (Hoy et al., 2003) and Hoy's (2001, 2002) Organizational Climate Descriptor Questionnaire (OCDQ) statements pertained to leadership behaviors identified in an organization. The 34 leadership behaviors statements included in this study were categorized into collegial, restrictive, supportive, and directive behaviors. All three measures were combined into one survey for this study. The questions were modified to include pronouns such as "I" and "me" in the statements for a total of 54 statements. As described in Chapter 3, the surveys were sent via email with an introduction and an invitation to participate. Each participant received the same anonymous link.

Table 4.1 presents demographic data regarding the participants in this study.

Participants included middle school principals in the northeastern region. Of the 28 principals selected for the study, 21 principals agreed to participate in this study. This represents a 75% participation rate. The majority of the principals were male (68%), were tenured (68%), and had earned two masters of arts or science degrees (23%). The majority (66%) of principals led a sixth-eighth grade school, while almost one-quarter (23%) led a sixth-12th grade school and the remainder (9%) led a K-eighth grade school.

Table 4.1

Sample Demographics

| Variable | % (n) |
|---------------------------------------|---------|
| Gender | |
| Male | 62 (13) |
| Female | 38 (8) |
| Ethnicity | |
| White | 38 (8) |
| Hispanic | 14 (3) |
| Black | 33 (7) |
| Other | 14 (3) |
| School Setting | |
| K-8 th grade | 9 (2) |
| 6-8 th grade | 66 (14) |
| 6-12 th grade | 23 (5) |
| Level of Education | |
| BA/BS and MA/MS | 4 (1) |
| MA/MS and 15-30 extra college credits | 23 (5) |
| 2 MA/MS | 52 (11) |
| Doctorate Degree | 1 (4) |
| Status | |
| Probationary | 38 (8) |
| Tenured | 62 (13) |

Twenty-one principals responded to the statements from the Principals Trust Survey (Tschannen-Moran, 1999), the Organizational Climate Survey, (Hoy et al., 2003), and Hoy's Organizational Climate Descriptor Survey (2000, 2001). Twenty-one participants responded to all of the 20 statements from the Principal Trust Survey (PTS); whereas, two participants did not respond to three leadership behavior statements from the Organizational Climate Surveys. Both participants were included in the study but the omitted statements were not included in the descriptive and correlational analyses.

The first section of this chapter discusses the descriptive and correlational analyses of the principals' trust in their major stakeholders (students, teachers, and parents). The second section describes the descriptive and correlational analyses of the principals' leadership behaviors (collegial, supportive, directive, and restrictive). The third section examines the correlational analysis of the concepts from the five faces of trust as applied to the principals' trust in each of their major stakeholders and their self-reported leadership behaviors.

Principals' trust, research question 1. The 21 principals who participated in this study responded to 20 statements related to their major stakeholders (parents, teachers, and students) on a 6-point Likert scale. The participants responded to nine statements related to their level of trust in teachers, six statements related to their level of trust in students, and five statements related to their level of trust in parents. Table 4.2 presents descriptive statistical data (minimum, maximum, mean, and standard deviation).

Research question 1 asked: To what extent do principals of high poverty urban middle schools trust their parents, teachers, and students? This was answered using descriptive statistics (see Table 4.2). The principals reported having moderate ($M = 3.40$)

to high trust ($M = 5.67$) in their major stakeholders. The mean for the principals' trust in stakeholders was close ($M = 4.41 - 4.52$), however, there was less variability in the standard deviation for teachers ($SD = .46$) than for students ($SD = .55$) or parents ($SD = .57$).

Table 4.2

Descriptive Statistics for Principals' Trust in Stakeholders

| | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|----------|---------|---------|------|----------------|
| Teachers | 3.63 | 5.25 | 4.51 | .46 |
| Parents | 3.40 | 5.40 | 4.41 | .57 |
| Students | 3.50 | 5.67 | 4.52 | .55 |

Kurtosis and skew statistics were used to screen the variables (parents, teachers, and students) for normal distribution. Zero values of skewness and kurtosis indicate a perfectly normal distribution and values in the range of -2 to +2 are considered close enough to normal to use parametric statistics (Huck, 2012). The kurtosis and skew statistics were within this range and, therefore, a Pearson correlational analysis was used.

Research question 1a asked, Are the high poverty urban middle school principals' level of trust in parents, teachers, and students significantly correlated with one another? As shown in Table 4.3, there was a significant correlation between the principals' trust in teachers and students ($r = .50, p < .05$). The higher the principals' level of trust was in teachers, the higher the level of trust was in students. Similarly, there was a significant correlation between the principals' trust in students and parents. When the level of principals' trust in students was high, the trust in parents was high as well ($r = .57$,

$p < .05$). However, there was no correlation between the principals' trust in teachers and in parents. This means that the principals' trust in teachers does not positively or negatively correlate to their trust in parents.

Table 4.3

Correlations among Principals' Level of Trust of Stakeholder Groups

| | Teachers | Parents | Students |
|----------|----------|---------|----------|
| Teachers | 1 | .12 | .50* |
| Parents | .1 | 1 | .57** |
| Students | .50* | .57** | 1 |

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

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

Leadership behaviors, research question 2. The participants in this study responded to statements from the Organizational Climate Index and Organization Climate Descriptor Questionnaire which were measured on a 4-point Likert scale with 1 representing rarely occurs to 4 representing very frequently occurs. Research question 2 asked, To what extent do the principals of high poverty urban middle schools report that they have used supportive, restrictive, collegial, and directive leadership behaviors?

Table 4.4 reports the mean score, standard deviation, minimum, and maximum score for each of the four leadership behaviors. The principals' range on the 4-point Likert-like scale was broad. The descriptive statistics revealed that principals more frequently reported collegial ($M = 3.33$) and supportive behaviors ($M = 3.34$) than directive ($M = 2.29$) or restrictive ($M = 1.64$) behaviors.

Table 4.4

Descriptive Statistics for Principals' Self-Reported Leadership Behaviors

| | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|-------------|---------|---------|------|----------------|
| Collegial | 2.57 | 4.00 | 3.33 | .37 |
| Supportive | 2.91 | 4.00 | 3.34 | .38 |
| Directive | 1.67 | 4.00 | 2.29 | .63 |
| Restrictive | 1.00 | 3.25 | 1.64 | .63 |

Research question 2a asked: Are the high poverty urban middle school principals' reporting of the use of the four types of leadership behavior significantly correlated with one another? Pearson correlations analysis answered research question 2a. Pearson correlations revealed significant relationships among 3 out of the 4 principals' leadership behaviors (see table 4.5). Collegial and supportive behaviors were significantly correlated ($r = .64, p < .05$) to one another. The more principals reported demonstrating supportive leadership behaviors, the more they also demonstrated directive leadership behaviors ($r = .55, p < .05$). The more principals demonstrated supportive leadership behaviors, the more they were engaged in directive leadership behaviors. There were no significant correlations between restrictive leadership behaviors and collegial, directive, or supportive leadership behaviors.

Table 4.5

Principals' Correlated Leadership Behaviors

| | Collegial | Supportive | Directive | Restrictive |
|-------------|-----------|------------|-----------|-------------|
| Collegial | 1 | .64** | .26 | -.14 |
| Supportive | .64** | 1 | .55* | -.15 |
| Directive | .26 | .55* | 1 | .32 |
| Restrictive | -.14 | -.15 | .32 | 1 |

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

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

Five faces of trust to principals' stakeholders, research question 3. The concepts of the five faces of trust (honesty, benevolence, competence, openness, and reliable) were applied to the 6-point Likert scaled questions in the Principal's Trust Survey. Research question 3 asked: To what extent are the principals' endorsements of the five faces of trust correlated when applied to trust in stakeholders? Table 4.6 displays descriptive statistics for the concepts five faces of trust applied to the Principal Trust Survey. Four out of the five concepts from the faces of trust (honesty, benevolence, competence, and reliable) were moderately to highly endorsed when principals reported on their relationships with the three stakeholder groups ($M = 4.52 - 4.76$). However, openness was endorsed at a noticeably lower level ($M = 3.52$). Similarly, the four constructs with higher means also had less variability in their scores ($SD = .44 - .58$) whereas openness had noticeably more variability ($SD = .83$).

Table 4.6

Five Faces of Trust as Applied to the Measures of Principals Trust in Stakeholders

| | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|-------------|---------|---------|------|----------------|
| Honesty | 3.25 | 5.50 | 4.57 | .58 |
| Benevolence | 4.00 | 5.50 | 4.76 | .46 |
| Competence | 3.67 | 5.33 | 4.54 | .44 |
| Openness | 1.33 | 5.33 | 3.52 | .83 |
| Reliable | 3.50 | 5.50 | 4.52 | .54 |

Table 4.7 displays the Pearson correlations for the five faces of trust as applied to the Principals trust in stakeholders. Benevolence and honesty ($r = .56$), Competence and honesty ($r = .60$), and reliable and honesty ($r = .62$) were significantly correlated with one another. Openness was not correlated to the any of the other concepts of the five faces of trust.

Table 4.7

Five Faces of Trust as Applied to the Measures of Principals Trust in Stakeholder

| | Benevolence | Honesty | Reliable | Competence | Openness |
|-------------|-------------|---------|----------|------------|----------|
| Benevolence | 1 | .56** | .17 | .38 | -.13 |
| Honesty | .56** | 1 | .62** | .59** | .08 |
| Reliable | .17 | .62** | 1 | .40 | .28 |
| Competence | .38 | .59** | .40 | 1 | .01 |
| Openness | -.13 | .08 | .28 | .01 | 1 |

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

Five faces of trust to principals' leadership behaviors, research question 4.

The concepts of the five faces of trust were applied to the 4-point Likert Organizational Climate Survey which related to the principals' leadership behaviors. Research question 4 asked: To what extent do the principals of high poverty urban middle schools demonstrate the five faces of trust in their leadership behaviors? Descriptive statistics and Pearson correlational analyses answered research question 4.

Table 4.8 is a descriptive analysis of the five faces of trust as applied to the measures of the principals' leadership behaviors. The measures for 4 out of the 5 concepts from the five faces of trust had similar ranges in the principals' leadership behaviors (honesty, benevolence, openness, and reliable). Competence had the largest range in responses (1.67 – 3.67). The greatest variability was for honesty ($SD = .53$) and competence ($SD = .53$); whereas the least variability was for reliable ($SD=.38$) and benevolence ($SD=.32$).

Table 4.8

Five Faces of Trust as Applied to the Measures of Principals' Leadership Behaviors

| | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|-------------|---------|---------|------|----------------|
| Honesty | 2.00 | 3.50 | 2.67 | .53 |
| Benevolence | 2.63 | 3.63 | 3.07 | .32 |
| Competence | 1.67 | 3.67 | 2.47 | .53 |
| Openness | 2.14 | 3.43 | 2.56 | .42 |
| Reliable | 2.50 | 4.00 | 3.12 | .38 |

Table 4.9 reports the Pearson correlations for the five faces of trust as applied to principals' leadership behaviors. There were six significant correlations: benevolence and

reliable ($r = .50$), openness and competence ($r = .59$), openness and honesty ($r = .67$), benevolence and competence ($r = .68$), openness and reliable ($r = .69$), and reliable and competence ($r = .80$).

Table 4.9

Principals Leadership Behaviors Correlated to the Concepts of the Five Faces of Trust

| | Benevolence | Honesty | Reliable | Competence | Openness |
|-------------|-------------|---------|----------|------------|----------|
| Benevolence | .29 | 1 | .50* | .68** | .39 |
| Honesty | 1 | .29 | .39 | .44 | .67** |
| Reliable | .39 | .50* | 1 | .80** | .69** |
| Competence | .44 | .68** | .80** | 1 | .58** |
| Openness | .67** | .39 | .69** | .58** | 1 |

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

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

Summary of Results

This chapter presented the findings of the high poverty middle school principals' trust in their stakeholders and their leadership behaviors. The five faces of trust were applied to the measures of both sections of the survey. The survey sections included Tschannen-Moran's Principals' Trust Survey and Hoy's Organizational Climate Surveys. Descriptive statistics and Pearson correlations were employed to examine the principals' level of trust in their stakeholders, their leadership behaviors, and the application of the concepts of the five faces of trust to the principals' level of trust in their stakeholders and their leadership behaviors. The four null hypothesis were rejected. There were positive correlations between and among the principals' trust in their major stakeholders, their

leadership behaviors, and the application of the concepts from the five faces of trust (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999).

The results for research questions 1 and 3 revealed that the higher the principals' trust was in the teacher, the higher the principals' trust was in the student ($r = .50, p < .05$). The same was true between the principals' level of trust in students and parents ($r = .57, p < .05$). Interestingly, there was no correlation between and among the principals' level of trust in teachers and parents. When the concepts of the five faces of trust were applied to the principals' level of trust in their stakeholders, there were three significant correlations: benevolence and honesty ($r = .56$), competence and honesty ($r = .60$), and reliable and honesty ($r = .62$). The concept of openness was not correlated to the other four concepts.

The results for research questions 2 and 4 revealed that the principals frequently used 3 out of the 4 leadership behaviors (directive, supportive, and collegial). There were two significant correlations. When principals demonstrated collegial behaviors, they also demonstrated supportive behaviors. Similarly, when they demonstrated supportive behaviors they demonstrated directive behaviors. However, restrictive behaviors were not correlated to the three behaviors and the principals reported rarely using restrictive behaviors. When the concepts of the five faces of trust were applied to the principals' leadership behaviors, there were six significant correlations. Three of the five concepts from the five faces of trust were correlated to openness, competence, honesty, and reliable. The final chapter will discuss the implications of these findings and make recommendations for further research.

Chapter 5: Discussion

Introduction

A vast pool of research examined in this study's literature review revealed that trusting relationships are essential when building a positive organizational climate (Covey, 2006; DuFour & Matthos, 2013; Hoy et al., 2003; Lawrence & Lynch, 2011). The level of trust in an organization can be determined by the attitudes of the stakeholders, the outcomes of the organization's goals, and the stakeholders' belief in the fairness of the organization's processes and systems (Covey, 2006; Covey & Link, 2012). Trust is the ingredient that impacts the organization's successes and failures (Lawrence & Lynch, 2011). It facilitates the social capital needed to improve the organizations' outcomes (Putnam, 2000, 2001).

Researchers have emphasized the need for leaders to bridge the social networks or social connectedness in an organization that develops trust, as lack of relationships leads to misconceptions and mistrust (Goddard, 2003; Lawrence & Lynch, 2011; Putnam, 2001, 2000). Leadership must build those relationships which provide the adhesive force in trust (Adams, 2013; Fukuyama, 1995). It is the bond between and among the stakeholders (Putnam, 2000).

It has been established in the literature that trust takes time to evolve (Handford & Leithwood, 2013; Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2000) and it is the responsibility of the leader to acknowledge and accurately assess the trust levels in the organization. Much research emphasizes the need for principals to have a birds' eye view of the levels of trust

so that they can cultivate, maintain, and restore it when necessary (Kutsyuruba et al., 2011).

The principal of the school has a direct impact on the school's effectiveness, climate, the attainment of instructional goals, and the fulfillment of the mission (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Fullan, 2014; Louis, 2007; Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2004). This has become increasingly harder for the principal with the rapid changes in school reforms that are imposed due to political and societal pressures and demands (Blankstein & Noguera, 2015). The need for principals to be trustworthy leaders is both more demanding and more important than ever. At the same time, the development of relationships is more complex and more desperately needed than ever in high poverty school settings (Bryk et al., 2010; Fullan, 2014; Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2004).

Although there is an abundance of research on relational trust through the eyes of students, parents, and teachers, as well as many studies on leadership behaviors that impact trust in schools, there is virtually no research on relational trust that includes the principals' level of trust in stakeholders and the leadership behaviors they employ and foster trust. The problem with the research on relational trust is that the principal, a vital stakeholder in a school, is not asked the same survey questions that parents, teachers, and students are asked. Principals have not been asked, "Whom do you trust?" Filling this void and asking that and other related questions was the purpose and significance of this dissertation.

This study was conducted in a northeastern urban school district in the United States. Principals from 28 middle schools were invited to participate. These principals came from varied middle school settings and had varying years of experience,

educational level, gender, and appointment status. Twenty-one out of 28 principals participated in this study. The researcher was interested in middle schools where the student population received free and reduced lunch under the Title I Federal Law. The primary method of data collection for this study was descriptive, inferential, correlational analyses.

This study begins to address the void in the existing research by applying descriptive, inferential, and correlational analyses between and among the principals' level of trust in his or her stakeholders, their leadership behaviors, and the application of the concepts from the five faces of trust (Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999) to the principals' level of trust in their stakeholders and their leadership behaviors. Chapter 4 explained the descriptive and correlational results. This chapter discusses the implications of the findings, their limitations, and recommendations for administration, policy makers, and future studies. These findings were in pursuit of the following research questions:

1. To what extent do principals of high poverty urban middle schools trust their parents, teachers, and students?
 - 1a. Are the high poverty urban middle school principals' level of trust in parents, teachers, and students significantly correlated with one another?
2. To what extent do the principals of high poverty urban middle schools report that they have used supportive, restrictive, collegial, and directive leadership behaviors?
 - 2a. Are the high poverty urban middle school principals' reporting of the four types of leadership behavior significantly correlated with one another?

3. To what extent are the principals' endorsements of the five faces of trust correlated when applied to trust in stakeholders?
4. To what extent are the principals' endorsements of the five faces of trust correlated when applied to self-reported leadership behaviors?

Implication of Findings

This study's findings have significant implications for principals' leadership behaviors and for relational trust. The findings are consistent with the studies of Tschannen-Moran and Hoy (1999, 2001), Bryk and Schneider (2002), Jensen (2012) and Adams (2010). Put very simply, the principals' trust and his or her leadership behaviors impact the school's culture.

Principals' trust in stakeholders. An important implication based on the survey results of 21 participants (principals) in this study showed that they had moderate to high trust in their stakeholders (parents, students, and teachers). The trust levels for parents and students were similar whereas the trust level for teachers was slightly different. This is an important implication for principals of high poverty urban middle schools as the trust level the principal has in teachers has a direct impact on the school's effectiveness, climate, the attainment of instructional goals, and the fulfillment of the mission (Bryk & Schneider, 2002; Fullan, 2014; Louis, 2007; Tschannen-Moran, 2004). Many other researchers have come to the same conclusion as in Jensen's (2009, 2013) books, *Teaching Children with Poverty in Mind* and *Engaging Children with Poverty in Mind*, and Tschannen-Moran's (2014) book, *Trust Matters: Leadership for Successful Schools*, and in the study by Kutsyuruba et al. (2011).

It is more demanding than ever for principals of high poverty middle schools to be trusting and trustworthy leaders as the development of relationships is complex. (Bryk et al., 2010; Fullan, 2014; Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2004). Principals trusted their stakeholders regardless of betrayal, or loyalty because the role of the principals is multifaceted (Kutsyuruba et al., 2011). This confirms that the relationships between the principal and teachers must be developed, cultivated, restored, and maintained, as it is vital for the students' success (Covey, 2006; Putnam, 2001).

There were two significant, correlational outcomes within the principals' levels of trust between and among their stakeholders. The implications of these findings impact policy makers and professional development needed in high poverty middle schools. The first finding is that the principals' level of trust in the students was impacted by the level of trust the principal had in their teachers. This is significant as high poverty schools are characterized as having unqualified teachers and low teacher retention, causing the development of trust to take longer. According to Jensen (2009, 2013) when teachers feel trusted by their principal the relationships forged with students were positive. This means that the teachers do not have to second guess their intentions. These results also confirm the teachers' self-efficacy. If teachers believe that they are trusted then they are willing to support the principals' vision, and willing to be vulnerable with students when implementing classroom practices and intervention (Tschannen-Moran & Gareis, 2004, 2015). Principals and teachers of high poverty schools must work in trusting relationships to confront the challenges that affect their students' success.

The second finding was that the level of the trust the principal had with the students impacted the level of trust principals had with their parents. This is significant as

it tells us that if students naturally performed well, were honest, and were responsible, they would be trusted and so would their parents. The parents would be perceived by the principal as being competent caretakers. In the study conducted by McCollum and Yoder (2011), they concluded that students who had a positive perception of their school's climate had positive academic aspirations. While there is no direct research to support this finding, it is important for principals to forge trusting relationships with their students and create a positive school environment that is conducive to learning (McCollum & Yoder, 2011). Also, principals need to believe and trust that they can create positive change in their students' lives (Tschannen-Moran, 2014).

Oddly, the relationship between the parent and teacher was not statistically significant in this study. Presumably the level of trust principals had in teachers did not impact the level of trust the principal had in parents. This finding is interesting in light of what the research states. Adams et al. (2009), concluded that parents impacted the level of trust school staff had in their students. Parents' trust in the principals and teacher was impacted when the child was academically engaged and motivated, whereas poor performance and behavioral problems lead to distrust (Adams et al., 2009).

Principals' leadership behaviors. This study identified four leadership behaviors (collegial, restrictive, supportive, and directive) and asked the 21 high poverty middle schools principals who participated in this study if they employed these behaviors rarely, sometimes, or frequently. The principals reported frequently using collegial leadership behavior. This means that they try to "meet the social needs of the faculty and achieve the goals of the school" (Hoy et al., 2003, p. 42). According to Hoy et al. (2003), collegial principals treat their teachers "as professional colleagues, are open, egalitarian,

and friendly, but at the same time set clear teacher expectations and standards of performance” (Hoy et al., 2003, p. 42). The principals also reported frequently using supportive leadership behaviors, which is “directed toward both the social needs and task achievement of faculty. This implies that the principal is helpful, genuinely concerned with teachers, and attempts to motivate by using constructive criticism and by setting an example through hard work” (Tarter et al., 1989, p. 296).

Directive leadership behaviors, i.e. rigid domineering behaviors were sometimes used by the principals. This implies that, “the principal maintains close and constant monitoring over virtually all aspects of teacher behavior in the school” (Tarter et al., 1989, p. 296). This monitoring is a process of ensuring expectations are met and holding stakeholders accountable (Fullan, 2014). Whereas, the principals reported rarely using restrictive leadership behaviors which implies that they rarely display behavior that hinders rather than facilitates teacher work. The principal who burdens teachers with paperwork, committee requirements, and other demands that interfere with their teaching responsibilities is not an effective school leader (Tarter et al., 1989).

The reporting of three out of four distinct leadership behaviors by the principals, suggests that principals utilize a variety of leadership styles when interacting with their stakeholders. The findings were consistent with the research on effective leadership behaviors found in schools (Bryk et al., 2010; Fullan, 2014; Santoyo, 2012; Tschannen-Moran, 2014). The use of supportive, collegial, and directive leadership behaviors in collaborative settings, or to ensure transparent communication and delegation are effective leadership styles. These behaviors enhance the principals’ ability to be

authentic, forthcoming, and open, causing their stakeholders to be confident, assertive, and resilient when developing relationships.

This is significant to professional development related to leadership behaviors that support a positive and trusting school climate. When stakeholders are engaged in collegial and supportive leadership behaviors, trusting relationships with the principal are established, resulting in their willingness to take risks and to be vulnerable with the principal (Hoy et al., 2003; Hoy & Tschannen-Moran, 1999; Tarter et al., 1989). Uncertainty over principal's vision, goals, and his or her stakeholder's perception is removed and relational trust is sustained (Bryk & Schneider 2002). Exuding collegial and supportive leadership behaviors results in strong networks which will promote students' academic success.

The data revealed significant relationships among three out of the four principals' leadership behaviors. When principals, in this study, demonstrated collegial leadership behaviors they also demonstrated supportive leadership behaviors. This means that principals were helpful, concerned, motivational, hard-working, open, friendly, and respectful. The principals provided meaningful feedback, set clear expectations, treated their stakeholders as their peers, and modeled the expected behaviors. In this study, when principals demonstrated supportive leadership behaviors, they also demonstrated directive leadership behaviors. This means that the principals also monitored the teachers' behaviors to ensure expectations are met and to hold people accountable (Fullan, 2014).

These findings are supported by the research identified by Tschannen-Moran (2014), Fullan (2014), Bryk et al. (2010), and Hoerr (2005). This is significant as

principals who set the tone for a collegial and supportive environment produce learning communities that foster student learning, stakeholders' trust, and teacher growth (Fullan, 2014; Hoerr, 2005; Santoyo, 2012). While some of the research frowns upon directive leadership behaviors (Hoy et al., 2003; Tarter et al., 1998), Fullan (2014) states that directive leadership behaviors are needed for principals to maintain a positive culture. He posits that principals must monitor the behaviors of competence, trustworthiness, communication, and integrity in themselves and in others. Similar to the findings in this study, Covey (2006) states that the principal of the school needs to talk straight and clarify expectations. Principals need to employ leadership behaviors that will develop a positive organizational and trusting climate that will result in positive school improvement.

Five faces of trust applied to the principal's level of trust in their stakeholders. The concepts of the five faces of trust (honesty, benevolence, competence, openness, and reliable) were applied to the Principals' Trust Survey (PTS). The principals in this study endorsed honesty, benevolence, competence, and reliability but did not endorse openness. This could imply that the survey statements in the PTS endorsed by the principals were closely aligned to the concept of openness or that there weren't enough statements matched to openness.

There were three significant relationships with the five faces of trust. The first relationship that was endorsed by principals was the connection between benevolence and honesty. This relationship implies that when benevolence was endorsed, honesty was also endorsed by the high poverty middle school principals. This means that the principals' trust will be impacted by the stakeholders' willingness to tell the truth, honor

agreements, keep their promises, accept responsibility, express appreciation, be fair, be supportive, and be genuine.

The second relationship that was endorsed by the principals was between competence and honesty. This correlation implies that if the principals endorsed the stakeholders' competence, then they endorsed the stakeholders' honesty. This indicates that if stakeholders demonstrate their vulnerability in problem solving, resolving conflict, flexibility, and modeling hard work, then the principals' level of trust in stakeholders would strengthen.

The third relationship that was endorsed by the principals was between reliable and honesty. This means, in addition to the concepts of the five faces of trust mentioned, the principal will have greater levels of trust in their stakeholders if they are consistent, dependable, committed, and diligent.

The findings of the application of the concepts in the five faces of trust to the principals' level of trust in their stakeholders shed light on the Lawrence and Lynch (2011) study on the "building of trust" and Covey's (2006) book *The Speed of Trust* and, *Smart Trust* by Covey and Link (2012). According to Covey (2006), principals must first have self-trust and must understand why they trust and why they don't trust. Similarly, Lawrence and Lynch (2011) posit that in order for trust to improve leaders must understand what causes trust and distrust. Lawrence and Lynch (2011) stated that for trust to be built, there are 12 actions one must take: (a) stay genuine, (b) be honest, (c) have integrity, (d) listen and ask questions, (e) have a purpose, (f) seek solution, (g) be collaborative by crediting others, (h) confront distrustful behaviors, (i) be humble,

apologize when you mess up, (j) be available, (k) recognize those who have integrity and honor, and (l) trust first but wisely.

If principals know and understand the behaviors that build and impact their trust in their stakeholders, they will have insight into the concepts in the five faces of trust they will endorse with their stakeholders. This indicates that principals will exercise their level of trust based on the stakeholders' behaviors and on what they know and on what they are able to do. Covey and Link (2012) share the importance for leaders to understand these crucial points – with what are you entrusting someone, what is the level of risk in extending that trust, and what is the credibility of those to which you extend trust. This suggests that the level of trust will be determined by someone's benevolence, honesty, reliability, competence, openness, or some combination of all of the above. While it is understood in the research that leaders are to trust first and demonstrate the expected behaviors needed to maintain that trust, it is equally important for principals to understand the behaviors that build and impact trust between and among stakeholders.

Five faces of trust applied to the principals' leadership behaviors. The concepts of the *five faces of trust* were applied to the four leadership behaviors (restrictive, directive, supportive, and collegial) described by Hoy's Organizational Climate Index (OCI) and Organizational Climate Descriptor Questionnaire (OCDQ). The results showed that when the five faces of trust are applied to the four leadership behaviors, four out of the five concepts are endorsed (openness, honesty, reliable, and benevolence). While openness did not impact the principals' level of trust in their stakeholders, openness impacts the principals' leadership behaviors. When openness is displayed in the principals' leadership behaviors, there is open communication, the

sharing of information, delegation, shared decision making, and shared power. This is significant for school leaders as the behaviors described in openness are practices that speak to a principal with an effective leadership style. According to Kouzes and Posner (2012) and Putnam (2001), the actions described are those of a transformational leader who is developing a system of social capital in his or her school.

In this study there were six relationships that were endorsed in the principals' leadership behaviors. The first relationship was benevolence and reliable, the second was openness and competence, the third was openness and honesty, the fourth was benevolence and competence, the fifth was openness and reliable, and the last was reliable and competence. This means that principals must engage in the dispositions identified from the five faces of trust in order to forge trusting relationships with their stakeholders. One can conclude that leaders who embody collegial and supportive leadership behaviors are honest, benevolent, open, and reliable. While competence was not endorsed, effective leaders must be competent in determining those leadership behaviors appropriate to each situation encountered in his or her school in order to build relational trust.

Similar to the relationships found in this study, Tschannen-Moran (2014) implies, that schools can facilitate trust by fostering trusting and trustworthy behaviors among all stakeholders. "Demonstrating benevolence or care lays a foundation of trust among teachers. Honesty, openness, and reliability also play a role. An interesting pattern of trust emerges however, when stakeholders lack respect for the competence of their colleagues" (Tschannen-Moran, 2014, p. 129). Trust will bring down barriers to building an effective school culture. Demir's (2009) findings are also similar to the findings in

this study. Demir concluded that when stakeholders participate in decision-making, an environment of mutual trust between the stakeholders and principal was created. This current study's conclusions were similar to the conclusions found in Louis' (2007) study. She found that trust in schools is built by collaboration, integrity, concern, competence, reliability, and sincerity.

It is clear from this study and from all the research that trust is a two-way street. It is impacted by an individual's disposition and behaviors. As the leader of the school, the principal must be the one to extend the trust in their stakeholders and model the trusting behaviors for their stakeholders so that positive relationships can be established. As Kouzes and Posner (2012) stated in the *Leadership Challenge, How to Make Extraordinary Things Happen in Organizations*, if the principal wants people to follow them, the principal needs to take the first step to build those trusting relationships.

Limitations

There were three limitations for this study. The first limitation was the amount of time available to conduct the study. Summer recess and school holidays resulted in limited access to principals which resulted in a smaller sample size. Twenty-one out of 28 middle school principals from three distinct grade configuration (K-eighth; sixth-eighth; sixth-12th grades) in an urban, high poverty, northeastern region of the United States participated in this study. The findings were generalized to the middle school principals who served in this region. Increasing the number of principals would allow for stronger descriptors and correlational analyses between and among trust and leadership behaviors between school setting, gender, education, principal status, and years of experience.

The second limitation to this study was the principal's self-reported responses. This leads to a third limitation to this study, which was the exclusion of the other stakeholders (parents, teachers, and students) in the research. A gap analysis would strengthen this study to include the perception of the major stakeholders (teachers, students, and parents) as to the principals' level of trust in them along with the stakeholders' perception of the principals' leadership behaviors and how closely they align with the principals self-reported leadership behaviors. Such a study would measure that gap between what the principal espouses and what the stakeholders perceive.

Recommendations for Future Research

The findings in this study (principals' trust in their stakeholders, their leadership behaviors, and the application of the five faces of trust to the principals' trust in their stakeholders and their leadership behaviors), indicated that trust and the leadership behaviors employed to build and nurture it matters for high poverty schools. The level of trust the principal exudes impacts the high poverty middle schools' climate. Principals can cultivate, restore, and maintain that trust by employing leadership practices that are supportive and collegial.

Based on this study's findings several recommendations for future research emerged. The specific leadership behaviors that are needed in high poverty schools need to be examined more comprehensively to determine their direct impact on stakeholders and particularly on student performance. It is not enough to say that principals influence the school's culture. We need to know more about the leadership behaviors and traits that bring about successful student outcomes that prevent negative interactions between stakeholders.

This study turned a lens on the principal and his or her level of trust in stakeholders as a new way to capture the schools' climate. But, all stakeholders need to respond to same survey used for this study. As discussed in the limitation section, a gap analysis on relational trust should be conducted to determine the principals' level of trust in stakeholders compared to stakeholders' trust in the principal. The results from this gap analysis could be analyzed along with interviews and focus groups which would shed further insight into relational trust. The outcomes of this study could inform professional development programs for all stakeholders in order to develop a positive and effective school climate.

Further research is required to correlate and describe statistically the relationship between and among the principals' level of trust in each of their stakeholders (students, parents, and teachers), the principals' leadership behaviors, and the concepts of the five faces of trust. It would be important to know, on more than just an inferential basis, the cause and effect relationships among these dependent variables. For instance, the principal's high level of trust in students could be correlated to the principals' use and practice of the five faces of trust (benevolence, openness, honesty, reliable, and competence).

Conclusion

Amid the demanding pressures reform measures have placed on principals, the findings in this study are not surprising. The results of this quantitative analysis revealed that trust, a vital force, in setting the tone and determining the effectiveness of the organization, is the responsibility of its leadership. The level of trust the principal has in his or her stakeholders (parents, students, and teachers) is a clear indicator of the

consistency, commitment, and communication that defines the school's culture.

Acknowledging the levels of trust in an organization is critical for the leader. Having a clear and honest sense of trust levels in the organization is the responsibility of its leadership (Tschannen-Moran, 2014). Moreover, research continues to apply effective leadership behaviors to the unique challenges of leading high poverty schools and the ongoing efforts to close the achievement gap. We know the principal is second to the teacher in impacting student achievement. Therefore, employing trusting leadership behaviors is the key in improving the success of high poverty middle school students.

The purpose of this study was to examine the principals' level of trust in their stakeholders, their leadership behaviors, and the concepts of the five faces of trust as applied to their level of trust in their stakeholders, and to their leadership behaviors. Up until now the research on relational trust did not include the principal, a vital stakeholder in a school. Principals were not given the same survey questions that parents, teachers, and students were given. Before this study, the research asked stakeholders for the level of trust they had in the principal and what leadership behaviors they thought principals should display in a school setting, but principals were not asked, "Whom do you trust?" This study asked that question and discovered significant relationships between trust levels, leadership behaviors, and the endorsement of the five faces of trust.

Results from the research suggest that principals must know and understand the behaviors that will build, nurture, and sustain trust in their schools. Employing these trusting behaviors will have the reciprocal effect of building stakeholder's trust in the principal and also building principal's trust in stakeholders. This is the special responsibility of the leader and it is particularly important in high poverty schools.

Although there is no single ingredient that will make high poverty schools effective and successful, having a principal who understands and practices the behaviors of trust makes success far more likely. Such a principal can bring teachers, parents, and students together to significantly improve student outcomes and their lives and careers after school (Wallace Foundation 2012).

References

- Adams, C. (2010). Social determinants of student trust in high poverty elementary schools. Analyzing school contexts: Influences of principals and teachers in the service of students. In W. Hoy & M. Dipaola (Eds.), *Analyzing school contexts: influences of principals and teachers in the service of students* (pp. 255-280). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Adams, C. M. (2013). Collective trust: a social indicator of instructional capacity. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 51(3), 363-382.
- Adams, C. M., & Forsyth, P. B. (2010). The nature and function of trust in schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, 19(2), 126-152.
- Adams, C. M., Forsyth, P. B., & Mitchell, R. M. (2009). The formation of parent-school trust a multilevel analysis. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(1), 4-33.
- AERD Statistics. (2016). *Two-way ANOVA in SPSS statistics*. Retrieved from <https://statistics.laerd.com/spss-tutorials/two-way-anova-using-spss-statistics.php>
- Blanchard, K. (2017). *Building trust: The critical link to a high-involvement, high-energy workplace begins with a common language*. Retrieved from <https://resources.kenblanchard.com/whitepapers/building-trust-in-the-workplace>
- Blankstein, A. M., & Noguera, P. (2015). *Excellence through equity: Five principles of courageous leadership to guide achievement for every student*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Bryk, A. S., & Schneider, B. (1996). *Social trust: A moral resource for school improvement. Final deliverable to OERI*. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED412630>
- Bryk, A., & Schneider, B. (2002). *Trust in schools: A core resource for improvement*. New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Bryk, A. S., Sebring, P. B., Allensworth, E., Easton, J. Q., & Luppescu, S. (2010). *Organizing schools for improvement: Lessons from Chicago*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- CCSSI. (2015). *Core standards*. Retrieved from <http://www.corestandards.org/about-the-standards>.

- Citizens' Committee for Children. (2012). *Concentrated poverty in New York city: An analysis of the changing geographic patterns of poverty*. Retrieved from: <https://www.cccnewyork.org/data-and-reports/publications/concentrated-poverty-in-new-york-city-an-analysis-of-the-changing-geographic-patterns-of-poverty/> no citation
- Covey, S. M. (2006). *The speed of trust: The one thing that changes everything*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- Covey, S. M. (2009). How the best leaders build trust. *Leadership Now*. Retrieved from <https://www.leadershipnow.com/CoveyOnTrust.html>
- Covey, S. (2011). Build high trust, cost drops, speed increases. *Leadership Excellence*.
- Covey, S. M., & Link, G. (2012). *Smart trust: Creating prosperity, energy, and joy in a low-trust world*. New York, NY: Simon and Schuster.
- CPE. (2005). *Organizing a school*. Retrieved from <http://www.centerforpubliceducation.org/Main-Menu/Organizing-a-school>
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oak, CA: Sage Publications.
- Curtis, C. (2012). Why do they choose to teach - and why do they leave? A study of middle school and high school mathematics teachers. *Education*, 132(4), 779-788.
- Cuthrell, K., Stapleton, J., & Ledford, C. (2010). Examining the culture of poverty: promising practices. *Preventing School Failure*, 54(2), 104-110.
- Daly, A. J. (2009). Rigid response in an age of accountability the potential of leadership and trust. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(2), 168-216.
- Demir, K. (2015). The effect of organizational trust on the culture of teacher leadership in primary schools. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 15(3), 621-634.
- Drucker, P. F. (1995). *People and performance: The best of Peter Drucker on management*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- DuFour, R., & Mattos, M. (2013). How do principals really improve schools. *Educational Leadership*, 70(7), 34-40.
- Explorable. (2013). *Statistical correlation*. Retrieved from <https://explorable.com/statistical-correlation>.

- Fowler Jr., F. J. (2014). *Survey research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Fox, W. & Bayat, M. S. (2007). *A guide to managing research*. Cape Town, South Africa: Juta.
- Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust: The social virtues and the creation of prosperity*, New York, NY: Free Press.
- Fullan, M. (2014). *The principal: Three keys to maximizing impact*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Gardner, D. P. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. An open letter to the American people. A report to the nation and the secretary of education*. Washington, DC: National Commission on Excellence in Education.
- Goddard, R. D. (2003). Relational networks, social trust, and norms: A social capital perspective on students' chances of academic success, *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 25(1), 59-74.
- Goddard, R. D., Salloum, S. J., & Berebitsky, D. (2009). Trust as a mediator of the relationships between poverty, racial composition, and academic achievement evidence from Michigan's public elementary schools. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(2), 292-311.
- 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(1), 3-17.
- Handford, V., & Leithwood, K. (2013). Why teachers trust school leaders. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 51(2), 194-212.
- Halpin, A., & Croft, D. (1963). The organizational climate and individual value systems upon job satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 22, 171-183.
- Hitt, M. A., & Duane, R. (2002). The essence of strategic leadership: Managing human and social capital. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 9(1), 3-14.
- Hoerr, T. R. (2005). *The art of school leadership*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Hoy, W. K. (2001). *Organizational climate index*. Retrieved from <http://waynekhoy.com/oci.html>
- Hoy, W. K. (2002). *Organizational climate descriptor questionnaire*. Retrieved from <http://waynekhoy.com/ocdq-rm.html>

- Hoy, W. K., Smith, P. A., Sweetland, S. R. (2003). The development of the organizational climate index for high schools: Its measure and relationship to faculty trust. *The High School Journal*, 86(2), 38-49.
- Hoy, W. K., Tarter, C. J., & Hoy, A. W. (2006). Academic optimism of schools: A force for student achievement. *American Educational Research Journal*, 43(3), 425-446.
- 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.
- Hoy, W. K., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (2007). The conceptualization and measurement of faculty trust in schools. In W. Hoy & M. DiPaola (Eds.). *Essential ideas for the reform of American schools* (pp. 87-114). Alexandria, VA: Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Huck, S. W (2012). *Reading statistics and research*. Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Jensen, E. (2009). *Teaching with poverty in mind: What being poor does to kids' brains and what schools can do about it*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Jensen, E. (2013). *Engaging students with poverty in mind practical strategies for raising achievement*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.
- Keating, C. (2012, January). Why trust matters so much in business. *Fortune*. Retrieved from <http://fortune.com/2012/01/27/why-trust-matters-so-much-in-business/>
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2012). *The leadership challenge: How to make extraordinary things happen in organizations*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kutsyruba, B., Walker, K., & Noonan, B. (2011). Restoring broken trust in the work of school principals. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 39(2), 81-95.
- Lawrence, P. R., & Lynch, R. P. (2011, May). Leadership and the structure of trust. *European Business Review*, 17-27. Retrieved from <http://www.europeanbusinessreview.com/leadership-and-the-structure-of-trust/>
- Leitch, C. M., McMullan, C., & Harrison, R. T. (2013). The development of entrepreneurial leadership: The role of human, social and institutional capital. *British Journal of Management*, 24(3), 347-366.
- Leithwood, K., Seashore, K., Anderson, S., & Wahlstrom, K. (2004). *Executive*

summary: Review of research: How leadership influences student learning.
Retrieved from <http://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/Documents/How-Leadership-Influences-Student-Learning-Executive-Summary.pdf>

Lin, N. (1999). Building a network theory of social capital. *Connections*, 22(1), 28-51.
Retrieved from http://www.insna.org/PDF/Connections/v22/1999_I-1-4.pdf

Louis, K. S. (2007). Trust and improvement in schools. *Journal of Educational Change*, 8(1), 1-24.

Lucchese, C. (2009) Don't count them out: Transitioning adolescents' perceptions of issues impacting learning in middle school. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://fisherpub.sjfc.edu/education_etd/100/

Lynch, R. L. (2008). *Building the pillars of trust*. Retrieved from http://www.sigridildine.com/The_Importance_of_Trust_V1.3.pdf

Makiewicz, M. K. (2011). *An investigation of teacher trust in the principal*. (Doctoral dissertation, UC Riverside). Retrieved from <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/74m1n1nx>

McCollum, E. C., & Yoder, N. P. (2011). School culture, teacher regard, and academic aspirations among middle school students. *Middle Grades Research Journal*, 6(2), 65-74.

Milner, H. R. (2013). Analyzing poverty, learning, and teaching through a critical race theory lens. *Review of Research in Education*, 37(1), 1-53.

Mind Tools. (2016). Building great work relationships. Retrieved from <https://www.mindtools.com/pages/article/good-relationships.htm>

Murnane, R. J. (2007). Improving the education of children living in poverty. *The Future of Children*, 17(2), 161-182.

National Conference of State Legislature. (2001). Literacy and no child left behind (NCLB). Retrieved from <http://www.ncsl.org/research/education/literacy-no-child-left-behind.aspx>

NYSED. (2004). *School accountability report: English language arts, mathematics, science and graduation rate*. Retrieved from <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/reprcdfall2003/school-accountability/151501060001.pdf>

- NYSED. (2016a). *Definitions of performance levels for the 2016 grades 3-8 English language arts tests*. Retrieved from <http://www.p12.nysed.gov/irs/ela-math/documents/ScaleScoretoPerformanceLevelELA.pdf>
- NYSED. (2016b). *Geographical district at a glance*. Retrieved from <https://data.nysed.gov/profile.php?instid=800000046547>
- NYSED. (2016c). *Glossary of terms – accountability data*. Retrieved from <https://data.nysed.gov/glossary.php?report=accountability>
- NYSED. (2016d). *Glossary of terms - assessment data*. Retrieved from <https://data.nysed.gov/glossary.php?report=assessment>
- NYSED. (2016e). *Grades 3-8 English language arts assessment data*. Retrieved from <https://data.nysed.gov/assessment38.php?subject=ELA&year=2016&county=32>
- NYSED. (2016f). *Grades 3-8 mathematics assessment data*. Retrieved from <https://data.nysed.gov/assessment38.php?subject=Mathematics&year=2016&county=32>
- No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Pub. L. 107-110, § 115, Stat. 1425 (2002).
- Noguera, P. (2003). *City schools and the American dream: Reclaiming the promise of public education*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Parrett, W. & Budge, K. M. (2012). *Turning high-poverty schools into high-performing schools*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD
- Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). *In search of excellence: Lessons from America's best companies*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. In L. Crothers, & C. Lockhart (Eds.) *Culture and Politics* (pp. 223-234). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Putnam, R. (2001). Social capital: Measurement and consequences. *Canadian Journal of Policy Research*, 2(1), 41-51.
- Research Methodology (2016). *Descriptive research*. Retrieved from <http://research-methodology.net/research-methodology/research-design/conclusive-research/descriptive-research/>
- Roby, D. E. (2011). Teacher leaders impacting school culture. *Education*, 131(4), 782.

- Rokeach, M. (1968). A theory of organization and change within value-attitude systems. *Journal of Social Issues*, 24(1), 13-33.
- Romero, L. S. (2015). Trust, behavior, and high school outcomes. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 53(2), 215-236.
- Santoyo, P. B. (2012). *Leverage leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Saphier, J., & King, M. (1985). J. Good seeds grow in strong cultures. *Educational Leadership*, Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_198503_saphier.pdf
- Seashore Louis, K., Dretzke, B., & Wahlstrom, K. (2010). How does leadership affect student achievement? Results from a national US survey. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 21(3), 315-336.
- Shoji, M. N., Haskins, A. R., Rangel, D. E., & Sorensen, K. N. (2014). The emergence of social capital in low-income Latino elementary schools. *Early childhood research quarterly*, 29(4), 600-613.
- Singh, M., & Al-Fadhli, H. (2011). Does school leadership matter in the NCLB era?. *Journal of Black Studies*, 42(5), 751-767.
- Sparks, S. (2008). Creating intentional collaboration. In C. Erkens (Ed.), *The collaborative teacher: Working together in a professional learning community*. (pp. 31-55). Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree.
- 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.
- The Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement. (2017). *Role of principal leadership in improving student achievement*. Retrieved from <http://www.readingrockets.org/article/role-principal-leadership-improving-student-achievement>
- The Character Education Partnership. (2010). *Developing and assessing school culture: A new level of accountability for schools*. Retrieved from http://www.character.org/uploads/PDFs/White_Papers/DevelopingandAssessingSchoolCulture.pdf
- Tilley, T. B. (2011). Success despite socio economics: A case study of a high achieving, high poverty school. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.liberty.edu/doctoral/430>.
- Trujillo, T.M., Hernandez, L. E. Jarrell, T., & Kissell, R. (2014). Community schools as

urban district reform: Analyzing Oakland's policy landscape through oral histories. *Urban Education*, 49(8), 895-929.

- Tschannen-Moran, M. (1999). *Principal trust survey*. Retrieved from <http://wmpeople.wm.edu/asset/index/mxtsch/principaltrust>
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2001). Collaboration and the need for trust. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 39(4), 308-331.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2009). Fostering teacher professionalism in schools the role of leadership orientation and trust. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 45(2), 217-247.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2011). In search of trust: Contributing to the understanding of a taken-for-granted construct. In M. DiPaola, & P. Forsyth (Eds.), *Leading research in educational administration: A Festschrift for Wayne K. Hoy* (1-16). Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Tschannen-Moran, M. (2014). *Trust matters: Leadership for successful schools*. San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., Bankole, R. A., Mitchell, R. M., & Moore Jr, D. M. (2013). Student academic optimism: A confirmatory factor analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 51(2), 150-175.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Barr, M. (2004). Fostering student learning: The relationship of collective teacher efficacy and student achievement. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 3(3), 189-209.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Gareis, C. R. (2004). Principals' sense of efficacy: Assessing a promising construct. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(5), 573-585.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Gareis, C. R. (2015). Faculty trust in the principal: An essential ingredient in high-performing schools. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 53(1), 66-92.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. K. (2000). A multidisciplinary analysis of the nature, meaning, and measurement of trust. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(4), 547-593.
- Tzanakis, M. (2013). Social capital in Bourdieu's, Coleman's and Putnam's theory: Empirical evidence and emergent measurement issues. *Educate*, 13(2), 2-23.
- U.S. Department of Education (2016). *Title I: Improving the academic achievement of the disadvantaged*. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/esea02/pg1.html>

Appendix A

Measuring Principals' Trust in Major Stakeholders Correlated to Leadership Behaviors in High Poverty Middle Schools

Q1 Do you agree to participate in this survey?

- Yes, Continue to Survey (1)
- No, Stop Survey (2)

Q2 My school setting includes

- K-8th grade (1)
- 6th-8th grade (2)
- 6th-12th grade (3)

Q3 I am a

- Male (1)
- Female (2)

Q4 I am

- White (1)
- Hispanic (2)
- African-American (3)
- Asian (4)
- Other (5)

Q5 Are you probationary or have you completed probation?

- I am a probationary principal. (1)
- I completed probation. (2)

Q6 My level of education is

- BA/BS and MA/MS (1)
- MA/MS and 15-30 extra college credits (2)
- 2 MA/MS (3)
- Doctorate degree (4)

Please indicate the extent that you agree or disagree with each of the statements about your school ranging from (1) representing strongly disagree to (6) representing strongly agree.

Q7 Teachers in this school are candid with me.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Agree (5)
- Strongly agree (6)

Q8 I can count on parents to support the school.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Agree (5)
- Strongly agree (6)

Q9 Students here really care about the school.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Agree (5)
- Strongly agree (6)

Q10 I have faith in the integrity of my teachers.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Agree (5)
- Strongly agree (6)

Q11 Students in this school can be counted on to do their work.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Agree (5)
- Strongly agree (6)

Q12 I believe in my teachers.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Neither agree nor disagree (4)
- Somewhat agree (5)
- Agree (6)
- Strongly agree (7)

Q13 Most students in this school are honest.

- Strongly Disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Agree (5)
- Strongly agree (6)

Q14 I question the competence of some of my teachers.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Agree (5)
- Strongly agree (6)

Q15 I am often suspicious of teachers' motives in this school.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Agree (5)
- Strongly agree (6)

Q16 Most students are able to do the required work.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Agree (5)
- Strongly agree (6)

Q17 I trust the students in this school.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Agree (5)
- Strongly agree (6)

Q18 When teachers in this school tell you something, you can believe it.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Agree (5)
- Strongly agree (6)

Q19 Even in difficult situations, I can depend on my teachers.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Agree (5)
- Strongly agree (6)

Q20 Parents in this school have integrity.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Agree (5)
- Strongly agree (6)

Q21 Parents in this school are reliable in their commitments.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Agree (5)
- Strongly agree (6)

Q22 Most parents openly share information with the school.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Agree (5)
- Strongly agree (6)

Q23 My teachers typically look out for me.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Agree (5)
- Strongly agree (6)

Q24 I trust the teachers in this school.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Agree (5)
- Strongly agree (6)

Q25 Students in this school are reliable.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Agree (5)
- Strongly agree (6)

Q26 Most parents here have good parenting skills.

- Strongly disagree (1)
- Disagree (2)
- Somewhat disagree (3)
- Somewhat agree (4)
- Agree (5)
- Strongly agree (6)

Please indicate the extent that you agree or disagree with each of the statements about your school ranging from (1) representing rarely occurs to (4) representing very frequently occurs.

Q27 I explore all sides of topics and admits that other opinions exist.

- Rarely Occurs (1)
- Sometimes Occurs (2)
- Often Occurs (3)
- Very Frequently Occurs (4)

Q28 I treat all faculty members as my equal.

- Rarely Occurs (1)
- Sometimes Occurs (2)
- Often Occurs (3)
- Very Frequently Occurs (4)

Q29 I am friendly and approachable.

- Rarely Occurs (1)
- Sometimes Occurs (2)
- Often Occurs (3)
- Very Frequently Occurs (4)

Q30 I let faculty know what is expected of them.

- Rarely Occurs (1)
- Sometimes Occurs (2)
- Often Occurs (3)
- Very Frequently Occurs (4)

Q31 I maintain definite standards of performance.

- Rarely Occurs (1)
- Sometimes Occurs (2)
- Often Occurs (3)
- Very Frequently Occurs (4)

Q32 I put suggestions made by the faculty into operation.

- Rarely Occurs (1)
- Sometimes Occurs (2)
- Often Occurs (3)
- Very Frequently Occurs (4)

Q33 I am willing to make changes.

- Rarely Occurs (1)
- Sometimes Occurs (2)
- Often Occurs (3)
- Very Frequently Occurs (4)

Q34 I compliment teachers.

- Rarely Occurs (1)
- Sometimes Occurs (2)
- Often Occurs (3)
- Very Frequently Occurs (4)

Q35 I encourage teacher autonomy.

- Rarely Occurs (1)
- Sometimes Occurs (2)
- Often Occurs (3)
- Very Frequently Occurs (4)

Q36 I go out of my way to help teachers.

- Rarely Occurs (1)
- Sometimes Occurs (2)
- Often Occurs (3)
- Very Frequently Occurs (4)

Q37 I am available after school to help teachers when assistance is needed.

- Rarely Occurs (1)
- Sometimes Occurs (2)
- Often Occurs (3)
- Very Frequently Occurs (4)

Q38 I use constructive criticism.

- Rarely Occurs (1)
- Sometimes Occurs (2)
- Often Occurs (3)
- Very Frequently Occurs (4)

Q39 I look out for the personal welfare of the faculty.

- Rarely Occurs (1)
- Sometimes Occurs (2)
- Often Occurs (3)
- Very Frequently Occurs (4)

Q40 I listen to and accept teachers' suggestions.

- Rarely Occurs (1)
- Sometimes Occurs (2)
- Often Occurs (3)
- Very Frequently Occurs (4)

Q41 I treat teachers as equals.

- Rarely Occurs (1)
- Sometimes Occurs (2)
- Often Occurs (3)
- Very Frequently Occurs (4)

Q42 I go out of my way to show appreciation to teachers.

- Rarely Occurs (1)
- Sometimes Occurs (2)
- Often Occurs (3)
- Very Frequently Occurs (4)

Q43 I accept and implement ideas suggested by faculty members.

- Rarely Occurs (1)
- Sometimes Occurs (2)
- Often Occurs (3)
- Very Frequently Occurs (4)

Q44 I set an example by working hard himself/herself.

- Rarely Occurs (1)
- Sometimes Occurs (2)
- Often Occurs (3)
- Very Frequently Occurs (4)

Q45 I rule with an iron fist.

- Rarely occurs (1)
- Sometimes Occurs (2)
- Often Occurs (3)
- Very Frequently Occurs (4)

Q46 I supervise teachers closely.

- Rarely Occurs (1)
- Sometimes Occurs (2)
- Often Occurs (3)
- Very Frequently Occurs (4)

Q47 I correct teachers' mistakes.

- Rarely Occurs (1)
- Sometimes Occurs (2)
- Often Occurs (3)
- Very Frequently Occurs (4)

Q48 I keep a close check on sign-in times.

- Rarely Occurs (1)
- Sometimes Occurs (2)
- Often Occurs (3)
- Very Frequently Occurs (4)

Q49 I monitor everything teachers do.

- Rarely Occurs (1)
- Sometimes Occurs (2)
- Often Occurs (3)
- Very Frequently Occurs (4)

Q50 I closely check teacher activities.

- Rarely Occurs (1)
- Sometimes Occurs (2)
- Often Occurs (3)
- Very Frequently Occurs (4)

Q51 Teachers are burdened with busywork.

- Rarely Occurs (1)
- Sometimes Occurs (2)
- Often Occurs (3)
- Very Frequently Occurs (4)

Q52 Routine duties interfere with the job of teaching.

- Rarely Occurs (1)
- Sometimes Occurs (2)
- Often Occurs (3)
- Very Frequently Occurs (4)

Q53 Administrative paperwork is burdensome at this school.

- Rarely Occurs (1)
- Sometimes Occurs (2)
- Often Occurs (3)
- Very Frequently Occurs (4)

Q54 Assigned non-teaching duties are excessive.

- Rarely Occurs (1)
- Sometimes Occurs (2)
- Often Occurs (3)
- Very Frequently Occurs (4)

Appendix B

Scoring Directions for Principal Trust Survey

Developed by Dr. Meghan Tschannen-Moran

Scoring directions are provided for each of these surveys, as well as evidence on the reliability and validity of the scales. Directions for calculating a standardized score are included so that schools can compare their results with other schools. The standardized score is presented on a scale with a mean of 500 and a standard deviation of 100, much like an SAT or GRE score. For example, a school with a score of 600 on faculty trust in colleagues is two standard deviations above the average score on faculty trust in colleagues of all schools in the sample. That means that the school has higher faculty trust in colleagues than 84% of the schools in the sample.

The range of the standardized scores is presented below:

If the score is 200, it is lower than 99% of the principals.

If the score is 300, it is lower than 97% of the principals.

If the score is 400, it is lower than 84% of the principals.

If the score is 500, it is average.

If the score is 600, it is higher than 84% of the principals.

If the score is 700, it is higher than 97% of the principals.

If the score is 800, it is higher than 99% of the principals.

The **Principal Trust Scale** measures the level of principal trust in three constituencies: Principal Trust in the Faculty, Principal Trust of Students, and Principal Trust in Parents.

Step 1: Reverse the response code the items that are negatively worded.

Because some items are written as negative rather than positive statements, the response code needs to be reverse, that is, [1=6, 2=5, 3=4, 4=3, 5=2, 6=1]. Items to be reverse-coded are identified by an asterisk. For the Principal Survey, these are items 8 and 9, but for this study these items are 14 and 15.

Step 2: Calculate the average score for each item on the survey.

You will need to calculate the average of all the responses to the survey for each item on the questionnaire. You can use a spreadsheet program like Microsoft Excel or calculate the means by hand. If you are using a statistical package such as SPSS, you can skip this step and go directly to Step 3 because the package will calculate the mean of the means.

Step 3: Calculate the mean score for your school on each of the three subscales:

Use your spreadsheet or statistical package to calculate the school means on each of the subscales.

| Developed By Tschannen-Moran | Modified for this study |
|--|--|
| Principal Trust in Teachers (1 + 4 + 6 + 8* + 9* + 12 + 13 + 17 + 18) / 9 | Principal Trust in Teachers (7 + 10 + 12 + 14* + 15* + 18 + 19 + 23 + 24) / 9 |
| Principal Trust in Students (3 + 5 + 7 + 10 + 11 + 19) / 6 | Principals Trust in Students (9 + 11 + 13 + 16 + 17 + 25) / 6 |
| Principal Trust in Parents (2 + 14 + 15 + 16 + 20) / 5 | Parents Trust in Parents (8 + 20 + 21 + 22 + 26) / 5 |

Step 4: Computing the Standardized Scores for the Principal Trust Scale for purposes of comparison.

You can convert your school score on each of the subscales to a standardized score with a mean of 500 and a standard deviation of 100 to make comparison with other schools possible. First compute the difference between your school score on principal trust of teachers (PTT) and the mean for the normative sample (PTT – 4.911). Then multiply the difference by one hundred [100(PTT – 4.911)]. Next divide the product by the standard deviation of the normative sample (.618). Then add 500 to the result. You have computed a standardized score **Standard Score for Principal Trust in Teachers**. Repeat the process for each subscale as follows:

For Principal Trust in Teachers, calculate a standardized trust score using the following formula:

$$\text{Standard Score for Principal Trust in Teachers (PTT)} = 100(\text{PTT} - 4.911) / .618 + 500$$

For Principal Trust in Students, calculate a standardized trust score using the following formula:

$$\text{Standard Score for Principal Trust in Students (PTS)} = 100(\text{PTS} - 4.827) / .587 + 500$$

For Principal Trust in Parents, calculate a standardized trust score using the following formula:

$$\text{Standard Score for Principal Trust in Parents (PTP)} = 100(\text{PTP} - 4.502) / .719 + 500$$

Appendix C

Scoring Directions for Organizational Climate Index- Collegial Leadership Developed by Dr. Wayne Hoy

The items are scored by assigning 1 to "rarely occurs," 2 to "sometimes occurs," 3 to "often occurs," and 4 to "very frequently occurs." Each questionnaire is scored, and then school scores are computed. For the purpose of this study, principals of an urban northeastern district in the United States were the participants.

Step 1: Score each item* for each respondent with the appropriate number (1, 2, 3, or 4). Then calculate the average for each item by summing all the scores for that item and dividing by number of participants who responded to that item. Some participants occasionally skip items; make sure you divide by the number of participants who responded to that item.

Step 2: Calculate the school score for each dimension by summing the school item means calculated in step 1. Use your spreadsheet or statistical package to calculate the principals means on the subscale.

The formulas are:

| Developed by Dr. Hoy | Modified in this study |
|--|---|
| Collegial Leadership (CL) = (1+3+5+10+13+20+27) / 7 | Collegial Leadership (CL) = (27+28+29+30+31+32+33) / 7 |

Convert the school subtest scores to standardized scores with a mean of 500 and a standard deviation of 100, which we call SdS score.

Standard Score for Collegial Leadership (SCL) = $100(\text{CL}-20.75)/2.658 + 500$.

Step 3: First compute the difference between your score (CL) and the mean for the normative sample (CL-20.75). Then multiply the difference by one hundred [$100(\text{CL}-20.75)$]. Next divide the product by the standard deviation of the normative sample (2.658). Then add 500 to the result. You have computed a Standard Score for Collegial Leadership of the Principal where the average is 500 and the standard deviation is 100. The range of these scores is presented below: If the score is 200, it is lower than 99% of the principals.

If the score is 300, it is lower than 97% of the principals.

If the score is 400, it is lower than 84% of the principals.

If the score is 500, it is average.

If the score is 600, it is higher than 84% of the principals.

If the score is 700, it is higher than 97% of the principals.

If the score is 800, it is higher than 99% of the principals.

Appendix D

Scoring Directions for Organizational Climate Descriptor Supportive, Restrictive, and Directive Developed by Dr. Wayne Hoy

For the purpose of this study, three subtest scores were used with middle school principals of an urban northeastern district in the United States.

The items are scored by assigning 1 to "rarely occurs," 2 to "sometimes occurs," 3 to "often occurs," and 4 to "very frequently occurs." When an item is reversed scored, it is scored "rarely occurs" receives a 4, "sometimes occurs" a 3, and so on. Each item is scored for each respondent, and then an average score for each item is computed by averaging the item responses across principals; remember the principal is the unit of analysis. The average principal scores for the items defining each subtest are added to yield subtest scores. The three subtest scores represent the climate profile for the school.

Step 1: Score each item for each respondent with the appropriate number (1, 2, 3, or 4).

Step 2: Calculate an average school score for each item. Add all the principals scores for each item and then divide by the number of principals. Round the scores to the nearest hundredth. This score represents the average principal item score. You should have 50 average school item scores before proceeding.

Step 3: Use your spreadsheet or statistical package to calculate the principals means on each of the subscales. Sum the average school item scores as follows:

| Subtest | Developed by Dr. Hoy | Modified for this study |
|------------------------|--|---|
| ○ Supportive Behavior | $(1+10+11+12+15+19+24+32+36+44+49) / 11$ | $(34+35+36+37+38+39+40+41+42+43+44) / 11$ |
| ○ Directive Behavior | $(9+20+33+37+38+41) / 6$ | $(45+46+47+48+49+50) / 6$ |
| ○ Restrictive Behavior | ○ $(3+4+39+42) / 4$ | ○ $(51+52+53+54) / 4$ |

For the purpose of this study, these 3 scores represent the leadership behaviors of the principals. You may wish to compare the principals profile with other principals across districts, gender, level of educations, and years of experience. In doing so, it is recommended that you convert each group of principals' or schools' score to a standardized score.

Wayne Hoy's study current database was drawn on middle schools from a large, diverse sample of schools from New Jersey which asked the survey questions to the major stakeholders. The average scores and standard deviations for each climate dimension (subtests) are summarized below:

| | Mean (M) | Std. Deviation (SD) |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
| Supportive Behavior (Sup) | 29.39 | 4.61 |
| Directive Behavior (Dir) | 12.09 | 2.40 |
| Restrictive Behavior (Res) | 9.11 | 1.52 |

First: Convert the school subtest scores to standardized scores with a mean of 500 and a standard deviation of 100, which we call SdS scores. Use the following formulas:

$$\text{SdS for Sup} = 100 \times (\text{Sup} - 29.39) / 4.61 + 500$$

Then compute the difference between your school score on Sup and the mean of 29.39 for the normative sample (Sup-29.39). Then multiply the difference by 100 [100 X (S-29.39)]. Next divide the product by standard deviation of the normative sample (4.61). Then add 500 to the result. You have computed a standardized score (SdS) for the supportive behavior subscale (Sup).

Next: Repeat the process for each dimension as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SdS for Dir} &= 100 \times (\text{Dir} - 12.09) / 2.40 + 500 \\ \text{SdS for Res} &= 100 \times (\text{Res} - 9.11) / 1.52 + 500 \\ \text{SdS for Col} &= 100 \times (\text{Col} - 29.30) / 3.01 + 500 \end{aligned}$$

You have standardized your school scores against the normative data provided in the New Jersey sample. The range of these scores is presented below:

- If the score is 200, it is lower than 99% of the principals.
- If the score is 300, it is lower than 97% of the principals.
- If the score is 400, it is lower than 84% of the principals.
- If the score is 500, it is average.
- If the score is 600, it is higher than 84% of the principals.
- If the score is 700, it is higher than 97% of the principals.
- If the score is 800, it is higher than 99% of the principals.

Appendix E

Emailed Permission from Dr. Wayne Hoy



From: Wayne Hoy <whoy@mac.com>
Sent: Wednesday, December 28, 2016 4:38:03 PM
To: Ortiz Liza
Subject: Re: Doctoral Student

Hi Liza—

You have my permission to use selected questions from our trust measure, but be sure to give the appropriate acknowledgement.

I do think the principal's trust in stakeholders is important in all schools, but especially urban ones.

Good luck.

Wayne

Wayne K. Hoy
Fawcett Professor Emeritus in
Education Administration
The Ohio State University
www.waynehoy.com

Appendix F

Trust Characteristics Matching Survey

Hello Colleagues,

As my panel of experts, I am asking you to complete this survey. The experts of this panel are former and current principals. This survey requires you to match the following words: benevolence, honesty, openness, reliable, and competence to the statement that best fits each one. The definitions of the words as defined by Hoy and Tschannen-Moran's, "Five Faces of Trust (1999)" are below:

- Benevolence: "The most common face of trust is a sense of benevolence, the confidence that one's well-being or something one cares about will be protected by the trusted person or group. One can count on the good will of the other to act in one's best interest. In an ongoing relationship, future actions or deeds may not be specified but only that there will be a mutual attitude of good will."
- Honesty: "Honesty speaks to character, integrity, and authenticity. Rotter (1967) defined trust as the expectancy that the word, promise, verbal or written statement of another individual or group can be relied upon (p. 651). Statements are truthful when they conform to "what really happened" from the person's perspective and when commitments made about future actions are kept. A correspondence between a person's statements and deeds characterizes integrity."
- Openness: "Openness is the extent to which relevant information is not withheld; it is a process by which individuals make themselves vulnerable by sharing information with others. Such openness signals a kind of reciprocal trust, a confidence that the information will not be exploited and that recipients can feel the same confidence in return. People who are guarded in the information they share provoke suspicion; others wonder what is being hidden and why."
- Reliable: "Reliability is the extent to which one can count on another to come through with what is needed. Reliability combines a sense of predictability with benevolence. Predictability alone is insufficient because a person can be consistently malevolent. What is required from another person or group might be something tangible (e.g., raw materials from a supplier) or intangible (e.g., a willingness to listen). Most interactions do not take place simultaneously but unfold over time."
- Competence: "There are times when good intentions are not enough. When a person is dependent on another and some level of skill is involved in fulfilling an expectation, then a person who mean well may nonetheless not be trusted. For

example, the patient of a young surgeon may feel that this doctor wishes very much to heal the patient, but if he or she has a poor performance record, the patient will likely not trust in the physician. Many of the situation in which we speak about trust in organizations have to do with competence.”

Thank you again for completing the survey.

Are you a

- Current Principal
- Former Principal

Are you/ were you the administrator of

- PreK- 2nd Grade
- Elementary School
- Prek-8th grade (ES/MS)
- Middle School
- 6th grade- 12th grade (MS/HS)
- High School

Select the characteristic of trust that best fits the statement.

Teachers in this school are candid with me.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I can count on parents to support the school.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

Students here really care about the school.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I have faith in the integrity of my teachers.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

Students in this school can be counted on to do their work.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

Most students in this school are honest.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I question the competence of some of my teachers.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I am often suspicious of teachers' motives in this school.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

Most students are able to do the required work.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

When teachers in this school tell you something, you can believe it.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

Even in difficult situations, I can depend on my teachers.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

Parents in this school have integrity.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

Parents in this school are reliable in their commitments.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

Most parents openly share information with the school.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

My teachers typically look out for me.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

Students in this school are reliable.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

Most parents here have good parenting skills.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I explore all sides of topics and admit that other opinions exist.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I treat all faculty members as equal.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I am friendly and approachable.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I let faculty know what is expected of them.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I maintain definite standards of performance.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I put suggestions made by the faculty into operation.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

The interactions between faculty members are cooperative.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I am willing to make changes.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I discuss classroom issues with teachers.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I look out for the personal welfare of faculty members.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I compliment teachers.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

Teachers are burdened with busywork.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

Routine duties interfere with the job of teaching.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I rule with an iron fist.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I encourage teacher autonomy.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I go out of my way to help teachers.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I am available after school to help teachers when assistance is needed.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I use constructive criticism.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I look out for the personal welfare of the faculty.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I listen to and accepts teachers' suggestions.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I treat teachers as equals.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I supervise teachers closely.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I correct teachers' mistakes.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I go out of my way to show appreciation to teachers.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I keep a close check on sign-in times.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I monitor everything teachers do.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

Administrative paperwork is burdensome at this school.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I closely check teacher activities.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

Assigned non-teaching duties are excessive.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I accept and implement ideas suggested by faculty members.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I set an example by working hard myself.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

Teachers do not trust the me enough to admit their mistakes.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I welcome challenges from teachers.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

When a crisis occurs, I deal with it so we can get back to teaching.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I often jump to conclusions.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I negotiate faculty differences without destroying the diversity of opinion.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

Teachers in this school are suspicious of most of my actions.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

Teachers in this school have faith in my integrity.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I typically act in the best interest of teachers.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I do not show concern for the teachers.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I am competent in doing my job.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

I don't tell teachers what is really going on.

- Benevolence
- Honesty
- Openness
- Reliable
- Competence

Appendix G

St. John Fisher College Informed Consent Form

Title of study: Whom Do I Trust? Measuring Principals' Trust in Major Stakeholders Correlated to Leadership Behaviors in High Poverty Middle Schools

Name of researcher: Liza Ortiz, Doctoral Candidate

Faculty Supervisor: Dr. Robert Siebert **Phone for further information:** [REDACTED]

Purpose of study: The purpose of this study is to fill a void in the research on relational trust in schools concluded by Tschannen-Moran and Hoy, Tschannen-Moran and Gareis, Bryk and Schneider. These researchers examined the levels of trust of the major stakeholders and provided recommended leadership practices for central and school level administrators. This study will explore the nature of the principals' trust, the principals' leadership behaviors with his/her stakeholders.

Place of study: Urban Northeastern School District **Length of participation:** 15 minutes

Risks and benefits: The expected risks and benefits of participation in this study are explained below: There are no feasible risks in this study. The results from this study will inform professional development for leaders in school by shedding light on the relationship between a principal's leadership behaviors/ trust characteristics, and their level of trust in her stakeholders.

Method for protecting confidentiality/privacy: Data collected are anonymous and your participation is voluntary. Findings will be reported only as aggregated data. You will be asked to complete a brief online survey that will require you to respond to statements on a Likert Like Scale. Completing the survey will only take about 20 minutes and all responses are kept confidential.

Your rights: As a research participant, you have the right to:

1. Have the purpose of the study, and the expected risks and benefits fully explained to you before you choose to participate.
2. Withdraw from participation at any time without penalty.
3. Refuse to answer a particular question without penalty.

4. Be informed of appropriate alternative procedures or courses of treatment, if any, that might be advantageous to you.
5. Be informed of the results of the study.

I have read the above, received a copy of this form, and I agree to participate in the “Whom Do I Trust? Measuring Principals’ Trust in Major Stakeholders Correlated to Leadership Behaviors in High Poverty Middle Schools” study.

Print Name (Participant)

Signature

Date

Print Name (Investigator)

Signature

Date

If you have any further questions regarding this study, please contact the researcher listed above. If you experience emotional or physical discomfort due to participation in this study, please contact the Health and Wellness Center at (585) 385-8280 for appropriate referrals.

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) of St. John Fisher College has reviewed this project. For any concerns regarding this study and/or if you experience any physical or emotional discomfort, you can contact Jill Rathbun by phone at [REDACTED] or by email at: irb@sjfc.edu.

Appendix H

Tschannen-Moran's Principal Trust Survey (PTS) Panel of Expert Crosswalk Application to the Concepts of Hoy and Tschannen-Moran's "Five Faces of Trust"

| Instrument | Statements | Category | Faces of Trust |
|-------------------|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------|
| PTS | 1. Teachers in this school are candid with me. | Principal Trust in Teachers | Openness |
| PTS | 2. I can count on parents to support the school. | Principal Trust in Parents | Reliable |
| PTS | 3. Students here really care about the school. | Principal Trust in Students | Benevolence |
| PTS | 4. I have faith in the integrity of my teachers. | Principal Trust in Teachers | Benevolence |
| PTS | 5. Students in this school can be counted on to do their work. | Principal Trust in Students | Reliable |
| PTS | 6. I believe in my teachers. | Principal Trust in Teachers | Benevolence |
| PTS | 7. Most students in this school are honest. | Principal Trust in Students | Honesty |
| PTS | 8. I question the competence of some of my teachers. | Principal Trust in Teachers | Competence |
| PTS | 9. I am often suspicious of teachers' motives in this school. | Principal Trust in Teachers | Honesty |
| PTS | 10. Most students are able to do the required work. | Principal Trust in Students | Competence |
| PTS | 11. I trust the students in this school. | Principal Trust in Students | (Trust) |
| PTS | 12. When teachers in this school tell you something, you can believe it. | Principal Trust in Teachers | Honesty |
| PTS | 13. Even in difficult situations, I can depend on my teachers. | Principal Trust in Teachers | Reliable |
| PTS | 14. Parents in this school have integrity. | Principal Trust in Parents | Honesty |
| PTS | 15. Parents in this school are reliable in their commitments | Principal Trust in Parents | Reliable |
| PTS | 16. Most parents openly share information with the school. | Principal Trust in Parents | Openness |
| PTS | 17. My teachers typically look out for me. (*) | Principal Trust in Teachers | * Reliable |
| PTS | 18. I trust the teachers in this school. | Principal Trust in Teachers | (Trust) |

| | | | |
|-----|---|-----------------------------|------------|
| PTS | 19. Students in this school are reliable. | Principal Trust in Students | Reliable |
| PTS | 20. Most parents here have good parenting skills. | Principal Trust in Parents | Competence |

**Hoy's Organization Climate Index (OCI)- Panel of Expert Crosswalk
Application to the Concepts from
Hoy and Tschannen-Moran's "Five Faces of Trust"**

| Instrument | Statements | Category | Faces of Trust |
|-------------------|---|----------------------|-----------------------|
| OCI | 1. I explore all sides of topics and admit that other opinions exist. (*) | Collegial Leadership | (*) Openness |
| OCI | 2. I treat all faculty members as equal. | Collegial Leadership | Benevolence |
| OCI | 3. I am friendly and approachable. | Collegial Leadership | Openness |
| OCI | 4. I let faculty know what is expected of them. | Collegial Leadership | Openness |
| OCI | 5. I maintain definite standards of performance. | Collegial Leadership | Competence |
| OCI | 6. I put suggestions made by the faculty into operation. | Collegial Leadership | Reliable |
| OCI | 7. I am willing to make changes. | Collegial Leadership | Openness |

**Hoy's Organizational Climate Dimension Questionnaire (OCDQ) Research for MS
Panel of Expert Crosswalk
Application to the Concepts from Hoy and Tschannen-Moran's "Five Faces of
Trust"**

| Instrument | Statements | Category | Faces of Trust |
|-------------------|--|----------------------|-----------------------|
| OCDQ-RM | 1. I compliment teachers. | Supportive Behavior | Benevolence |
| OCDQ-RM | 2. Teachers are burdened with busywork. (*) | Restrictive Behavior | (*) Competence |
| OCDQ-RM | 3. Routine duties interfere with the job of teaching. | Restrictive Behavior | Benevolence |
| OCDQ-RM | 4. I rule with an iron fist. | Directive Behavior | Openness |
| OCDQ-RM | 5. I encourage teacher autonomy. | Supportive Behavior | Openness |
| OCDQ-RM | 6. I go out of my way to help teachers. | Supportive Behavior | Benevolence |
| OCDQ-RM | 7. I am available after school to help teachers when assistance is needed. | Supportive Behavior | Benevolence |
| OCDQ-RM | 8. I use constructive criticism. | Supportive Behavior | Honesty |
| OCDQ-RM | 9. I look out for the personal welfare of the faculty. | Supportive Behavior | Benevolence |
| OCDQ-RM | 10. I listen to and accepts teachers' suggestions. | Supportive Behavior | Openness |
| OCDQ-RM | 11. I treat teachers as equals. | Supportive Behavior | Benevolence |
| OCDQ-RM | 12. I supervise teachers closely. | Directive Behavior | Competence |
| OCDQ-RM | 13. I correct teachers' mistakes. | Directive Behavior | Competence |
| OCDQ-RM | 14. I go out of my way to show appreciation to teachers. | Supportive Behavior | Benevolence |
| OCDQ-RM | 15. I keep a close check on sign-in times. | Directive Principal | Reliable |
| OCDQ-RM | 16. I monitor everything teachers do. | Directive Behavior | Competence |
| OCDQ-RM | 17. Administrative paperwork is burdensome at this school. | Restrictive Behavior | Honesty |
| OCDQ-RM | 18. I closely check teacher activities. (*) | Directive Behavior | (*) Reliable |
| OCDQ-RM | 19. Assigned non-teaching duties are excessive. | Restrictive Behavior | Competence |
| OCDQ-RM | 20. I accept and implement ideas suggested by faculty members. | Supportive Behavior | Openness |
| OCDQ-RM | 21. I set an example by working hard myself. | Supportive Behavior | Competence |