

## Intro

### • Purpose

- Does faculty trust<sup>1</sup> occur across secondary schools in Flanders?
- Exploring faculty trust dimensions  
(*students, parents, colleagues and the principal*)
- Relating structural and compositional school characteristics to faculty trust

### • Relevance

- Trust is related to school effectiveness<sup>2,3,4,5,6</sup>

### • Academic embeddedness

- Growing interest on trust within educational research ↔ little systematic research
- Influence of school context → **school effects research**<sup>7</sup> → teacher outcomes<sup>8</sup>

## Trust in Schools

### • Trust is a **complex and multidimensional** concept:

*General willingness to be vulnerable + the five facets of trust*  
(Reliability – Benevolence – Competence – Honesty – Openness)<sup>3</sup>

### • Trust → organizational **social capital**<sup>9</sup> → enhanced school functioning<sup>5</sup>

### • Two research lines

- Bryk & Schneider<sup>5</sup>: 'Relational Trust Perspective'  
→ *Importance of 'normative expectations' within role relationships*
- Hoy & colleagues<sup>cf.1,2,3</sup>: 'Teachers' collective perceptions of trust in the school context'

## Faculty Trust

### • Teachers in a particular school = **similar role & same school context**

- social information processes → collective trust<sup>10</sup>

### • A **shared** level of trust among teachers within the same school

- a staff's trust **culture**<sup>11</sup>

### • Four dimensions of FT related to diverse **referent groups**

- FT in students, parents, colleagues and the principal
- FT in students and parents forming a unitary concept: 'FT in clients'<sup>2,12</sup>

### • **Structural & compositional school features** related to trust

- School sector – Socioeconomic context – Ethnic context – Gender context

## Methodology

### • Data

- Flemish Educational Assessment 2004-2005
- 80 schools with > 5 teachers responding  
(cf. critical mass for aggregation<sup>2</sup>)
- 2.091 teachers & 11.872 students (third and/or fifth grade)

### • Research design

- 29 items derived from the trust scales of Hoy & Tschannen-Moran (1999)<sup>3</sup>  
→ *Translated and transformed to measure individual attitudes on trust*
- Factor analysis on the individual trust items gives **four trust dimensions**

### • Individual Teacher Trust Scales

	Students	Parents	Colleagues	The principal
Cronbach's alpha	0.77	0.78	0.89	0.90

### • Faculty Trust Scales

- FT = group feature
- aggregating teacher scores from a same school
- legitimate to aggregate?
- index of "mean rater reliability" based on the ICC from a oneway analysis of variance [(BMS-WMS)/BMS]<sup>13,14</sup>
- Aggregating individual scores at the school level by calculating the mean **permitted** for each trust dimension (ICC's > 0.60)<sup>13,14</sup>
- The means for each FT dimension differ significantly between schools (p < 0.001)

## FT Dimensions

### Bivariate Correlations between Faculty Trust Dimensions

	Faculty trust in parents	Faculty trust in students	Faculty trust in colleagues	Faculty trust in the principal
Faculty trust in parents	(0,82) <sup>a</sup> (0,19) <sup>b</sup>	0,780***	0,230*	0,172
Faculty trust in students		(0,87) <sup>a</sup> (0,24) <sup>b</sup>	0,228*	0,304**
Faculty trust in colleagues			(0,72) <sup>a</sup> (0,13) <sup>b</sup>	0,292**
Faculty trust in the principal				(0,81) <sup>a</sup> (0,18) <sup>b</sup>

\*p < 0.05; \*\*p < 0.01; \*\*\*p < 0.001

<sup>a</sup> ICC's for the 'faculty trust'-scales = [(BMS-WMS)/BMS](Glick, 1985; Shrout & Fleiss, 1979)

<sup>b</sup> Rho's for the 'faculty trust'-scales = VPC = (SSB/SSB+SSW)

## Results

### Regression Analyses between Faculty Trust Dimensions & School Characteristics

FT Dimension	SES composition	Gender composition	Ethnic composition	School sector	Adj. R <sup>2</sup>
FT in Students (N=80)	High proportion of low SES students (-)***	High proportion of female students (+)***			67.4%***
FT in Parents (N=80)	High proportion of low SES students (-)***		High proportion of immigrant students (-)*		59.6%***
FT in Colleagues (N=79)	High proportion of low SES students (-)**		High proportion of immigrant students (+)*	Private schools (+)**	14.3%**
FT in the Principal (N=79)		High proportion of female teachers (+)**			6.6%

\*p ≤ 0.05; \*\*p ≤ 0.01; \*\*\*p ≤ 0.001

## Discussion & Conclusion

### • Individual teachers' trust

- *Teachers discern trust in students, parents, colleagues and their principal*

### • Teachers from the same school = a shared level of trust on each trust dimension

- **Faculty trust exists in Flanders' secondary schools**
- **Faculty trust is composed of four dimensions**

### • 'Faculty trust in clients': probably not a unitary construct<sup>2,12</sup>

### • Structural and compositional school characteristics

- do explain FT in students, parents and colleagues
- 'FT in the principal': more attention needed on aspects of the principal's behaviour and character<sup>15</sup>

### • Private (catholic) schools show more 'FT in colleagues'

- Social capital theory from Coleman & Hoffer (1987)<sup>16</sup>

### • An all determining negative effect from a **low socioeconomic student body**

- on FT in students, parents and colleagues
- Role of the students' study culture and the staff's academic culture???

### • Influence of the **students' ethnic composition**:

- FT in students: explained by SES composition
- FT in parents: *negative* effect
- FT in colleagues: **positive** effect  
= Mutuality leading to trust<sup>17</sup>  
Vs.  
= Category-based trust<sup>18</sup>

### • The importance of **school context** when analyzing teacher trust

### • Raising the staff's **awareness** of their attitudinal trends

### • Further research on teachers' trust

- Individual and collective trust as both an **input and process variable**

1. Hoy & Kupersmith (1985), Educational & Psychological Research, 5(1)

2. Goddard et al. (2001), Elementary School Journal, 102(1)

3. Hoy & Tschannen-Moran (1999), Journal of School Leadership, 9(3)

4. Gamoran et al. (2005), pp. 111-126 in Hedges & Schneider (Eds.), The Social Organization of Schooling

5. Bryk & Schneider (2002), Trust in Schools: A Core Resource for Improvement

6. Kochanek (2005), Building Trust for Better Schools: Research-Based Practices

7. Teddlie & Reynolds (2000), The International Handbook of School Effectiveness Research

8. Coe & Fitz-Gibbon (1998), Oxford Review of Education, 24(4)

9. Leana & Van Buren (1999), Academy of Management Review, 24(3)

10. Shamir & Lapidot (2003), Organization Studies, 24(3)

11. Van Houtte (2005), School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 16(1)

12. Rowan (1990), Review of Research in Education, 16

13. Glick (1985), Academy of Management Review, 10(3)

14. Shrout & Fleiss (1979), Psychological Bulletin, 86(2)

15. Dirks & Skarlicki (2004), pp. 21-40 in Kramer & Cook (Eds.), Trust and Distrust in Organizations

16. Coleman & Hoffer (1987), Public and Private High Schools: The Impact of Communities

17. Troman (2000), British Journal of Sociology of Education, 21(3)

18. Kramer (1999), Annual Review of Psychology, 50(1)